EXHIBIT 4

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
AND
THE STATE OF IDAHO

IN THE MATTER OF: Stibnite Mine Site Stibnite, Idaho Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. [MGII/MGC] Proceeding Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9675	CERCLA Docket No. _____ **ADMINISTRATIVE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER ON CONSENT FOR [REMOVAL] ACTIONS**

I. JURISDICTION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. This Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent (Settlement) is entered into voluntarily by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State of Idaho (State) and Midas Gold Corp. (MGC) as the owner of Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. (MGII) and Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC (IGRCLLC) IGRCLLC as the owner of Stibnite Gold Company (SGC), with MGII being the Site Operator and IGRCLLC and SGC being the owners of various patented, unpatented and mill site claims that comprise the property. This Settlement provides for the performance of Work by MGII in connection with the property located in Valley County, Idaho, known as the Stibnite Mine Site (Site).

2. This Settlement is issued under the authority vested in the President of the United States by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9675. This authority was delegated to the Administrator of EPA on January 23, 1987, by Executive Order 12580, 52 Fed. Reg. 2923 (Jan. 29, 1987), and further delegated to Regional Administrators by EPA Delegation Nos. 14-14-C (Administrative Actions Through Consent Orders, Apr. 15, 1994). This Settlement is also entered into pursuant to the authority of the Attorney General to compromise and settle claims of the United States.

3. MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC represent that they will meet all of the BFPP provisions in CERCLA §§ 101(40)(A)-(H) and 107(r)(l), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601(40)(A)-(H) and 9607(r)(l) and that they will continue to comply with these requirements during the time in which they have an operational and/or ownership interest in the Site. In view, however, of the complex nature and significant extent of the Work to be performed in connection with the Site, and the risk of claims under CERCLA being asserted against MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC as a consequence of their activities at the Site pursuant to this Settlement, one of the purposes of this Settlement is to resolve, subject to the reservations and limitations contained in Section [INSERT] (Reservations of Rights by United States), any potential liability of MGII, MGC, IGRC and SGC under CERCLA for the Existing Contamination as defined by Paragraph 8 below.

4. EPA, MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC recognize that this Settlement has been negotiated in good faith. MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC agree to comply with and be bound by the terms of this Settlement and they further agree that they will not contest the basis or validity of this Settlement or its terms.

II. PARTIES BOUND

5. This Settlement is binding upon EPA and upon MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC, SGC and their successors and assigns. Any change in ownership or corporate status of MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC including, but not limited to, any transfer of assets or real or personal property shall not alter MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC or SGC's responsibilities under this Settlement.

6. Each undersigned representative of MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Settlement and to execute and legally bind MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC to this Settlement.

7. MGII, as the Site Operator, shall provide a copy of this Settlement to each contractor hired to perform the Work required by this Settlement and to each person representing MGII with respect to the Site or the Work, and shall condition all contracts entered into hereunder upon performance of the Work in conformity with the terms of this Settlement. MGII or its contractors shall provide written notice of the Settlement to all subcontractors hired to perform any portion of the Work required by this Settlement. MGII shall nonetheless be responsible for ensuring that its contractors and subcontractors perform the Work in accordance with the terms of this Settlement.

III. DEFINITIONS

8. Unless otherwise expressly provided in this Settlement, terms used in this Settlement that are defined in CERCLA or in regulations promulgated under CERCLA shall have the meaning assigned to them in CERCLA or in such regulations. Whenever terms listed below are used in this Settlement or its attached appendices, the following definitions shall apply:

"BFPP" shall mean a bona fide prospective purchaser as described in Section 101(40) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(40).

"CERCLA" shall mean the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9675.

"Day" or "day" shall mean a calendar day. In computing any period of time under this Settlement, where the last day would fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal or State holiday, the period shall run until the close of business of the next working day.

"Effective Date" shall mean the effective date of this Settlement as provided in Section [INSERT].

"EFSFSR" shall mean the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River.

"EPA" shall mean the United States Environmental Protection Agency and its successor departments, agencies, or instrumentalities.

"EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund" shall mean the Hazardous Substance Superfund established by the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. § 9507.

"Existing Contamination" shall mean:

a. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials present or existing on or under the Site as of the Effective Date;

b. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials that migrated from the Site prior to the Effective Date; and

c. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials presently at the Site that migrate onto or under or from the Site after the Effective Date.

"Future Response Costs" shall mean all costs, including, but not limited to, direct and indirect costs, not inconsistent with the NCP, that the United States and the State incur in reviewing or developing deliverables submitted pursuant to this Settlement, in overseeing implementation of the Work, or otherwise implementing, overseeing, or enforcing this Settlement, including but not limited to, payroll costs, contractor costs, travel costs, laboratory costs.

"IDEQ" shall mean the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and any successor departments or agencies of the State.

"IGRCLLC" shall mean Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate specified for interest on investments of the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund established by 26 U.S.C. § 9507, compounded annually on October 1 of each year, in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a). The applicable rate of interest shall be the rate in effect at the time the interest accrues. The rate of interest is subject to change on October 1 of each year. Rates are available online at http://www.epa.gov/superfund/superfund-interest-rates.

"MGC" shall mean Midas Gold Corporation.

"MGII" shall mean Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.

"National Contingency Plan" or "NCP" shall mean the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9605, codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 300, and any amendments thereto.

"Paragraph" shall mean a portion of this Settlement identified by an Arabic numeral or an upper or lower case letter.

"Parties" shall mean EPA, the State, MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC.

"Plan of Restoration and Operations" or "PRO" shall mean the approved plan of operations by the United States Forest Service pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 228.5.

"RCRA" shall mean the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901-6992 (also known as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act).

"RPM" shall mean the Remedial Project Manager as defined in 40 C.F.R. § 300.5.

"SGC" shall mean Stibnite Gold Company.

"Stibnite Special Account" shall mean the special account within the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund, established for the Site by EPA pursuant to Section 122(b)(3) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9622(b)(3).

"Section" shall mean a portion of this Settlement identified by a Roman numeral.

"Settlement" shall mean this Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent for Removal Action and all appendices attached hereto (listed in Section [INSERT] (Integration/Appendices)). In the event of conflict between this Settlement and any appendix, this Settlement shall control.

"Site" shall mean the Stibnite Mine Site, located in Stibnite, Idaho, approximately 15 miles east of Yellow Pine, Idaho in Valley County, Idaho, 78 miles from McCall, and depicted generally on the map attached as Appendix A.

"State" shall mean the State of Idaho.

"Statement of Work" or "SOW" shall mean the document describing the activities MGII must perform pursuant to this Settlement, as set forth in Appendix B, and any modifications made thereto in accordance with this Settlement.

"United States" shall mean the United States of America and each department, agency, and instrumentality of the United States, including EPA.

"Waste Material" shall mean (a) any "hazardous substance" under Section 101(14) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(14); (b) any pollutant or contaminant under Section 101(33) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(33); (c) any "solid waste" under Section 1004(27) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27); and (d) any "hazardous substances" under Idaho Chapter 34A-11.

"Work" shall mean all activities and obligations MGII is required to perform under this Settlement except those required by Section [INSERT] (Record Retention).

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

9. MGII is a wholly owned subsidiary of MGC. MGC is a Canadian company doing business in the State of Idaho through MGII. Pursuant to the United States Forest Service Plan of Restoration and Operations and 36 CFR 228.3 (b), MGII is an "operator," which is "[a] person conducting or proposing to conduct operations" on the Site.

10. IGRCLLC and SGC are owners of patented lode claims, patented mill site claims, unpatented federal lode claims and unpatented federal mill site claims which cover approximately 27,104 acres (approximately 42 square miles).

11. The Stibnite Mine Site is located on the Payette National Forest in Valley County, Idaho, approximately 15 miles east of Yellow Pine, Idaho, 40 miles east of McCall, Idaho and 98 miles east of Boise, Idaho.

12. Mining at the Site began in the mid-1920s and continued into the 1950s. This first period of activity involved the mining of gold, silver, antimony, and tungsten mineralized materials by both underground and, later, open-pit mining methods.

13. During World War II, the Site is estimated to have produced more than 90% of the Nation's antimony and 65% of the Nation's tungsten, materials that were used in advancing the war effort, including munitions, steel-making, fire retardants, and other purposes. Strategic mining operations continued through much of the Korean War, and antimony, gold, and tungsten mining and milling ceased in 1952, near the end of the Korean War.

14. A second major period of activity at the Site began with exploration activities in 1972, and was followed by open-pit mining and seasonable on-off heap leaching and one-time heap leaching from 1982 to 1997. With ore provided by multiple operators from a number of locations, and processed in adjacent heap-leaching facilities, over 10 million tons of ore were mined and processed.

15. During the years of production, millions of cubic yards of mine tailings were deposited at locations within the Site, and in some cases, spent ore was permanently placed over historical Stibnite mill tailings that had previously been discarded.

16. Past additional actions at the Site include building removal, equipment removal, the 1965 failure of a hydropower dam on the East Fork of Meadow Creek (commonly referred to as "Blowout Creek), and the creation and storage of Waste Materials deposited at locations within the Site.

17. The mining activity at the Site resulted in CERCLA remedial actions by EPA, the Forest Service and the State of Idaho. Among other actions, minor quantities of legacy tailings have been removed, Meadow Creek was re-channelized, and certain legacy tailings impoundments have been covered with clean fill.

18. The Site has been subject to substantial cost recovery litigation under CERCLA, and several consent decrees emerged from these actions including *Mobil Oil v. United States*, Civ. No. 99-1467-A (D. Virginia) (consent decree filed June 26, 2000); *United States v. Oberbillig* (D. Idaho) (consent decree filed March 18, 2004; and *United States v. Bradley Mining Company*, Case No. 3:08-CV-03968 TEH and *United States v. Bradley Mining Company*, Case No. 3:08-CV-05501 TEH (N.D. Ca.) (consent decree filed April 19, 2012).

19. In some of the above-noted cost recovery litigation, the Site has been alleged to be a CERCLA "facility" as defined by Section 101 (9) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 (9).

20. Notwithstanding multiple completed response actions, legacy tailings and contamination remain buried and unremediated over much of the Stibnite Mine Site.

21. MGII's Plan of Restoration and Operations, as approved by the Forest Service, will disturb legacy areas at the Stibnite Mine Site. By entering into this Agreement, the Parties understand that it is the intent of MGII to remove and then productively mine certain legacy tailings that have been previously deposited in areas of the Site. In some cases, such as the spent heap leach ore disposal area (SODA)/Bradley Tailings, remediation has previously been undertaken under CERCLA.

22. The general sequence of mining will be the Yellow Pine deposit first, Hangar Flats deposit second, and the West End deposit third. This mining sequence is guided by the restoration aspects of the Stibnite Gold Project, which includes backfilling the Yellow Pine Pit with West End development rock to restore the approximate original gradient of the EFSFSR, to provide permanent fish passage, and facilitate aquatic habitat enhancement.

23. As a part of the reuse of legacy tailings and subsequent restoration of certain areas on the Site, MGII will become an "operator" of a "facility" and the execution of its PRO will involve the "arranging for disposal of hazardous substances" under CERCLA § 107(a)(1)-(4).

24. Accordingly, present releases or threats of future releases of hazardous substances exist on the Site.

25. The estimates for direct employment from the Stibnite Mine Site are 594 construction jobs; 583 operations jobs; 160 reclamation jobs; and 44 monitoring jobs.

V. DETERMINATIONS

26. Based on the Statement of Facts set forth above, EPA has determined that:

a. The Stibnite Mine Site is a "facility" as defined by Section 101(9) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9).

b. The contamination found at the Site, as identified in the Findings of Fact above, includes "hazardous substances" as defined by Section 101(14) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(14).

c. MGII is a "person" as defined by Section 101(21) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(21).

d. Pursuant to the Plan of Restoration and Operations, MGII, IGRCLLC and SGC are the "owner(s)" and/or "operator(s)" of the facility, as defined by Section 101(20) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20), and within the meaning of Section 107(a)(1) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a)(1).

e. As the owner of MGII, MGC is a derivative "owner" and/or "operator" of the facility, as defined by Section 101(20) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20), and within the meaning of Section 107(a)(1) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a)(1).

f. The conditions described in the Statements of Facts above constitute an actual or threatened "release" of a hazardous substance from the facility as defined by Section 101(22) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(22).

g. The Work required by this Settlement is necessary to protect the public health, welfare, or the environment and, if carried out in compliance with the terms of this Settlement, will be consistent with the NCP, as provided in Section 300.700(c)(3)(ii) of the NCP. [All on-Site actions required pursuant to this Agreement shall, to the extent practicable, as determined by EPA, considering the exigencies of the situation, attain applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements ("ARARs") under federal environmental or state environmental or facility siting laws. [MGII] shall identify ARARs in the Work Plan subject to EPA approval.]]

VI. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND ORDER

27. Based upon the Statements of Facts and Determinations set forth above, it is hereby Ordered and Agreed that MGII shall comply with all provisions of this Settlement, including, but not limited to, all appendices to this Settlement and all documents incorporated by reference into this Settlement.

VII. DESIGNATION OF CONTRACTOR, PROJECT COORDINATOR, AND REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER

28. MGII may retain one or more contractors or subcontractors to perform the Work and shall notify EPA of the names, titles, addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, and qualifications of such contractors or subcontractors within 7 days after the Effective Date or such date on which a contractor or subcontractor is proposed for selection, whichever date is later. MGII shall also notify EPA of the names, titles, contact information, and qualifications of any other contractors or subcontractors retained to perform the Work at least 7 days prior to commencement of such Work. EPA retains the right to disapprove of any or all of the contractors and/or subcontractors retained by MGII. If EPA disapproves of a selected contractor or subcontractor, MGII shall retain a different contractor or subcontractor and shall notify EPA of that contractor's or subcontractor's name, title, contact information, and qualifications as soon as practicable after EPA's disapproval. With respect to any proposed contractor performing activities related to the Work, MGII shall demonstrate that the proposed contractor demonstrates compliance with ASQ/ANSI E4:2014 "Quality management systems for environmental information and technology programs - Requirements with guidance for use" (American Society for Quality, February 2014), by submitting a copy of the proposed contractor's Quality Management Plan (QMP). The QMP should be prepared in accordance with "EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans (QA/R-2)" (EPA/240/B-01/002, Reissued May 2006) or equivalent documentation as determined by EPA. The

qualifications of the persons undertaking the Work for MGII shall be subject to EPA's review for verification based on objective assessment criteria (*e.g.*, experience, capacity, technical expertise) and that they do not have a conflict of interest with respect to the project.

29. MGII has designated, and EPA has approved, [INSERT NAME] as its Project Coordinator who shall be responsible for administration of all actions by MGII required by this Settlement. To the greatest extent possible, the Project Coordinator shall be present on Site or readily available during Site work. EPA and retains the right to disapprove of the designated Project Coordinator who does not meet the requirements of Paragraph [INSERT]. If EPA disapproves of the designated Project Coordinator, MGII shall retain a different Project Coordinator and shall notify EPA of that person's name, title, contact information, and qualifications within 7 days following EPA's disapproval or such date on which a different Project Coordinator is proposed for selection, whichever date is later. Notice or communication relating to this Settlement from EPA to MGII's Project Coordinator shall constitute notice or communication to MGII.

30. EPA has designated [INSERT] the Superfund Remedial Program, as its Remedial Project Manager (RPM). EPA and MGII shall have the right, subject to Paragraph [INSERT], to change their respective designated RPM or Project Coordinator. MGII shall notify EPA 7 days before such a change is made. The initial notification by MGII may be made orally, but shall be promptly followed by a written notice.

31. The RPM shall be responsible for overseeing MGII's implementation of this Settlement. The RPM shall have the authority stated in the NCP, including the authority to halt, conduct, or direct any Work required by this Settlement, or to direct any other response action undertaken at the Site. Absence of the RPM from the Site shall not be cause for stoppage of work unless specifically directed by the RPM.

VIII. WORK TO BE PERFORMED

32. MGII shall perform, at a minimum, all actions necessary to implement the SOW and approved Work Plans. A general description of the activities includes, but are not limited to, the following:

a. **SODA Area**.

(1) Approximately 3.5 million tons of legacy tailings in the SODA Area will be removed from their historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek Valley to be reprocessed and disposed of within the tailings storage facility (TSF).

(2) Approximately 10.5 million tons of legacy spent ore in the SODA will be removed from their historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek Valley to be reused in the construction of the TSF dam.

b. **Yellow Pine Pit Area**. During construction, the EFSFSR, Hennessy Creek, and other seeps and springs must be diverted around the

perimeter of the Yellow Pine Pit in order to protect water quality and prevent water from filling the pit during operations. The Pit will be dewatered, and the river will be temporarily rerouted through a fish-friendly tunnel capable of providing fish passage to the EFSFSR and Meadow Creek while the river channel is being fully restored. Additionally, restoration for this element of Work includes response actions related to the impacts to the EFSFSR north of the Yellow Pine Pit, south of the Yellow Pine Pit to the confluence of Meadow Creek, and upstream to undisturbed areas of the EFSFSR from its confluence [at Meadow Creek].

c. **Plant Site Area**. Construction will require removal of contamination of the former Monday Camp shops, as well as the crusher buildings and will require management of seepage and runoff from various DRSF and former ore stockpiles. The removal activity will also require stabilization of former underground portals.

d. **West End Area**. West End Creek will be temporarily diverted around the West End Pit and West End DRSF during operations. The West End Pit will be mined until the end of operations; however, wetland mitigation projects in and adjacent to the Pit may run concurrently with the final phases of mining. Wetlands on benches around the perimeter of the West End Pit Lake will be created to provide a stable spillway channel through the historical development rock dump downstream of the lake outlet.

e. **Blowout Creek (East Fork of Meadow Creek) Restoration and Enhancement**. Blowout Creek (East Fork of Meadow Creek) will be restored to reduce sedimentation and restore wetland functionality. Action will enhance fish habitat in EFSFSR and Meadow Creek to provide salmon spawning beds and increase fish populations.

f. **Fiddle Creek Area**. Fiddle Creek will be diverted around the perimeter of the DRSF in a channel to protect water quality and prevent surface water from running onto the DRSF. Response action will be taken for the former north tunnel DRSF, and removal could require possible closure, stabilization of old portal and clean-up of the quarry site.

g. **Other**. [PLACEHOLDER FOR OTHER REMOVAL ACTIONS IF NECESSARY, SUCH AS NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURE DISTURBANCES ON OR AROUND LEGACY AREAS]

33. For any regulation or guidance referenced in the Settlement, the reference will be read to include any subsequent modification, amendment, or replacement of such regulation or guidance. Such modifications, amendments, or replacements apply to the Work only after MGII receives notification from EPA of the modification, amendment, or replacement.

34. **Work Plans and Implementation**

a. Within 30 days after the Effective Date, in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT] (Submission of Deliverables), MGII shall submit to EPA for approval a draft work plan to implement the SOW generally described in Paragraph [INSERT] and [INSERT] above. The Work implementing the SOWs generally described in Paragraph [INSERT] is collectively referred to as the "Work Plans." The draft Work Plans shall provide a description of, and an expeditious schedule for, the actions required by this Settlement.

b. EPA may approve, disapprove, require revisions to, or modify each draft Work Plan in whole or in part provided such disapproval is reasonable and not arbitrary and capricious. If EPA requires revisions, MGII shall submit a revised draft Work Plan within 7 days of receipt of EPA's notification of the required revisions, but may be extended by EPA for good cause related to the extent and scope of matters addressed in the Work Plan. MGII shall implement the Work Plan as approved in writing by EPA in accordance with the schedule approved by EPA. Once approved, or approved with modifications, the Work Plan, the schedule, and any subsequent modifications shall be incorporated into and become fully enforceable under this Settlement.

c. Upon approval or approval with modifications of the Work Plans, MGII shall, upon notification to EPA that appropriate funding and other preparation pursuant to this agreement is in place, commence implementation of the Work in accordance with the schedule included therein. MGII shall not commence or perform any Work except in conformance with the terms of this Settlement.

d. Unless otherwise provided in this Settlement, any additional deliverables that require EPA approval under the SOW and/or Work Plan shall be reviewed and approved by EPA in accordance with this Paragraph.

35. **Submission of Deliverables**

a. General Requirements for Deliverables

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Settlement, MGII shall direct all submissions required by this Settlement to the RPM by email at [INSERT] or mail to:

and the State at:

MGII shall submit all deliverables required by this Settlement, the attached SOW, or any approved work plan to EPA in accordance with the schedule set forth in such plan.

(2) MGII shall submit all deliverables in electronic form and paper copies of all final versions of reports, SAP, QAPP, maps and figures shall also be submitted to EPA and the State. Technical specifications for sampling and monitoring data and spatial data are addressed in Paragraph [INSERT]. All other deliverables shall be submitted to EPA in the form specified by the RPM. If any deliverable includes maps, drawings, or other exhibits that are larger than 8.5x11 inches, MGII shall also provide EPA with paper copies of such exhibits.

b. Technical Specifications for Submission of Environmental Data. [RESERVE FOR REGION 10 SPECIFICS]

36. Health and Safety Plan. In accordance with the schedule set forth in the SOW, MGII shall submit for EPA review and comment a plan that ensures the protection of the public health and safety during performance of on-site work under this Settlement. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with "OSWER Integrated Health and Safety Program Operating Practices for OSWER Field Activities," Pub. 9285.0-OIC (Nov. 2002), available on the NSCEP database at http://www.epa.gov/nscep, and "EPA's Emergency Responder Health and Safety Manual," OSWER Directive 9285.3-12 (July 2005 and updates), available at http://www.epaosc.org/HealthSafetvManual/manual-index.htm. In addition, the plan shall comply with all currently applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations found at 29 C.F.R. Part 1910. If EPA determines that it is appropriate, the plan shall also include contingency planning for potential mine impacted water releases. EPA may comment and make recommendation to the Health and Safety Plan, however, MGII assumes full responsibility to adhere to applicable OSHA and MSHA regulations, as appropriate. MGII shall incorporate all changes to the plan recommended by EPA provided such recommendations are reasonable and not arbitrary and capricious and shall implement the plan during the pendency of the response action.

37. Quality Assurance, Sampling, and Data Analysis

a. MGII shall use quality assurance, quality control, and other technical activities and chain of custody procedures for all environmental samples collected related to the Work consistent with "EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/R5)" EPA/240/B-01/003 (March 2001, reissued May 2006), "Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/G-5)" EPA/240/R-02/009 (December 2002), or "Uniform Federal Policy for Quality Assurance Project Plans," Parts 1-3, EPA/505/B-04/900A-900C (March 2005).

b. Sampling and Analysis Plan. Within 7 days after the Effective Date or before commencing Work, MGII shall submit a Sampling and Analysis Plan related to the Work to EPA for review and approval. This plan shall consist of a Field Sampling Plan (FSP) and a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) that is consistent with the SOW, the NCP and applicable guidance documents, including, but not limited to, "Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/G-5)" EPA/240/R-02/009 (December 2002), "EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QA/R-5)"

EPA 240/B-01/003 (March 2001, reissued May 2006), or "Uniform Federal Policy for Quality Assurance Project Plans," Parts 1-3, EPA/505/B-04/900A-900C (March 2005). Upon its approval by EPA, the Sampling and Analysis Plan shall be incorporated into and become enforceable under this Settlement. For current Region 8 QA requirements and guidance, refer to https://www.epa.gov/qualitv/managing-qualitv-environmental-data-epa-region-8.

c. MGII shall ensure that EPA and State personnel and their authorized representatives are allowed access at reasonable times to all laboratories utilized by MGII in implementing this Settlement. In addition, MGII shall ensure that such laboratories shall analyze pursuant to this Settlement all samples submitted by EPA pursuant to the QAPP for quality assurance, quality control, and technical activities that will satisfy the stated performance criteria as specified in the QAPP and that environmental sampling and field activities are conducted in accordance with the Agency's "EPA QA Field Activities Procedure," CIO 2105-P- 02.1 (9/23/2014) available at http://www.epa.gov/innpoli8/epa-qa-field-activities-procedures. MGII shall ensure that the laboratories they utilize for the analysis of samples taken pursuant to this Settlement meet the competency requirements set forth in EPA's "Policy to Assure Competency of Laboratories, Field Sampling, and Other Organizations Generating Environmental Measurement Data under Agency-Funded Acquisitions" available at http://www.epa.gov/measurements/documents-about-measurement-competencv-under-acquisition-agreements and that the laboratories perform all analyses according to accepted EPA methods. Accepted EPA methods consist of, but are not limited to, methods that are documented in the EPA's Contract Laboratory Program (http://www.epa.gov/clp), SW 846 "Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods" (http://www3.epa.gov/epawaste/lrazard/testmethods/sw846/online/index.htm), "Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater" (http://www.standardmethods.org/). 40 C.F.R. Part 136, "Air Toxics - Monitoring Methods" (http://www3.epa.gov/ttnamtil/airtox.html).

d. However, upon approval by EPA, after a reasonable opportunity for review and comment by the State, MGII may use other appropriate analytical method(s), as long as (i) quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) criteria are contained in the method(s) and the method(s) are included in the QAPP, (ii) the analytical method(s) are at least as stringent as the methods listed above, and (iii) the method(s) have been approved for use by a nationally recognized organization responsible for verification and publication of analytical methods, *e.g.*, EPA, ASTM, NIOSH, OSHA, MSHA, etc. MGII shall ensure that all laboratories they use for analysis of samples taken pursuant to this Settlement have a documented Quality System that complies with ASQ/ANSI E4:2014 "Quality management systems for environmental information and technology programs - Requirements with guidance for use" (American Society for Quality, February 2014), and "EPA Requirements for Quality Management Plans (QA/R-2)" EPA/240/B- 01/002 (March 2001, reissued May 2006), or equivalent documentation as determined by EPA. EPA may consider Environmental Response Laboratory Network (ERLN) laboratories, laboratories accredited under the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP), or laboratories that meet International Standardization Organization (ISO 17025) standards or other nationally recognized

programs as meeting the Quality System requirements. MGII shall ensure that all field methodologies utilized in collecting samples for subsequent analysis pursuant to this Settlement are conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in the QAPP approved by EPA.

e. Upon request, MGII shall provide split or duplicate environmental samples related to the Work to EPA and the State or their authorized representatives. MGII shall notify EPA and the State not less than 7 days in advance of any sample collection activity unless shorter notice is agreed to by EPA. In addition, EPA and the State shall have the right to take any additional samples related to the Work that EPA or the State deem necessary. Upon request, EPA and the State shall provide to MGII split or duplicate samples of any samples they take as part of EPA's oversight of MGII's implementation of the Work.

f. Other than resource related data associated with the exploration activities, mine production and mill operations assays, MGII shall submit to EPA and the State results of all sampling and/or tests or other data obtained or generated by or on behalf of MGII with respect to the Site and/or the implementation of this Settlement.

38. Progress Reports. MGII shall submit a quarterly written progress report to EPA and the State concerning actions undertaken pursuant to this Settlement, or as otherwise requested by EPA, from 30 days after the Effective Date until issuance of Notice of Completion of Work pursuant to Section [INSERT], unless otherwise directed in writing by the RPM. These reports shall describe all significant developments during the preceding period, including the actions performed and any problems encountered, analytical data received during the reporting period, and the developments anticipated during the next reporting period, including a schedule of actions to be performed, anticipated problems, and planned resolutions of past or anticipated problems.

39. Final Report. Within 60 days after completion of all Work required by this Settlement, other than continuing obligations listed in Paragraph [INSERT] (Notice of Completion), MGII shall submit for EPA review and approval a final report summarizing the actions taken to comply with this Settlement. The format of the final report or reports is included in the SOW. The final report shall conform, at a minimum, with the requirements set forth in Section 300.165 of the NCP titled "OSC Reports." The final report shall include a good faith estimate of total costs or a statement of actual costs incurred in complying with the Settlement, a listing of quantities and types of materials removed off-Site or handled on-Site, a discussion of removal and disposal options considered for those materials, a listing of the ultimate destination(s) of those materials, a presentation of the analytical results of all sampling and analyses performed, and accompanying appendices containing all relevant and material documentation generated during the Work (*e.g.*, manifests, invoices, bills, contracts, and permits). The final report shall also include the following certification signed by a responsible corporate official of MGII or MGII's Project Coordinator: "I certify under penalty of law that to the best of my knowledge, after appropriate inquiries of all relevant persons involved in the preparation of this document and all attachments, the information submitted is true, accurate, and complete. I have no personal knowledge that the information submitted is

other than true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."

40. Off-Site Shipments and Wastes Generated On-Site

a. MGII may ship hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants from the Site to an off-Site facility only if it complies with Section 121(d)(3) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9621(d)(3), and 40 C.F.R. § 300.440. MGII will be deemed to be in compliance with CERCLA Section 121(d)(3) and 40 C.F.R. § 300.440 regarding a shipment if MGII obtains a prior determination from EPA that the proposed receiving facility for such shipment is acceptable under the criteria of 40 C.F.R. § 300.440(b).

b. MGII may ship Waste Material from the Site to an out-of-state waste management facility only if, prior to any shipment, it provides written notice to the appropriate state environmental official in the receiving facility's state and to the RPM. This written notice requirement shall not apply to any off-Site shipments when the total quantity of all such shipments will not exceed ten cubic yards. The written notice must include the following information, if available: (1) the name and location of the receiving facility; (2) the type and quantity of Waste Material to be shipped; (3) the schedule for the shipment; and (4) the method of transportation. MGII also shall notify the state environmental official referenced above and the RPM of any major changes in the shipment plan, such as a decision to ship the Waste Material to a different out-of-state facility. MGII shall provide the written notice after the award of the contract for the Work and before the Waste Material is shipped.

c. MGII may ship Investigation Derived Waste (IDW) from the Site to an off-Site facility only if they comply with Section 121(d)(3) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9621(d)(3), 40 C.F.R. § 300.440, EPA's "Guide to Management of Investigation Derived Waste," OSWER 9345.3-03FS (Jan. 1992), and any IDW-specific. Wastes shipped off-Site to a laboratory for characterization, and RCRA hazardous wastes that meet the requirements for an exemption from RCRA under 40 C.F.R. § 261.4(e) shipped off-Site for treatability studies, are not subject to 40 C.F.R. § 300.440.

IX. PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS

41. MGII agrees to provide the State, EPA, its authorized officers, employees, representatives, and all other persons performing response actions under EPA oversight, an irrevocable right of access at all reasonable times to the Site and to any other property owned or controlled by MGII, IGRC, and SGC to which access is required for the implementation of response actions at the Site. EPA agrees to provide reasonable notice to MGII, IGRC, and SGC of the timing of response actions to be undertaken at the Site and other areas owned or controlled by MGII.

42. For so long as MGII is an operator of the Property, MGII shall require that assignees, successors in interest, and any other parties with rights to use the Property shall provide access and cooperation to the State, EPA, its authorized officers,

employees, representatives, and all other persons performing response actions under EPA oversight. MGII shall require that assignees, successors in interest and other parties with rights to use the Property implement and comply with any land use restrictions and institutional controls on the Property in connection with the Work, and not contest EPA's authority to enforce any land use restrictions and institutional controls on the Site.

43. MGII shall provide a copy of this Settlement to any current and other party with rights to use the Site as of the Effective Date.

44. Notwithstanding any provision of this Settlement, EPA and the State retain all of their access authorities and rights, as well as all of its rights to require land, water or other resource use restrictions, including enforcement authorities related thereto, under CERCLA, RCRA, and any other applicable statute or regulations.

X. ACCESS TO INFORMATION

45. MGII shall, subject to the record retention period in Paragraph [INSERT] and, if necessary, in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT], provide to EPA and the State, upon request, copies of all records, reports, documents, and other information (including records, reports, documents, and other information in electronic form) within MGII's possession or control as of or after the Effective Date relating to Work at the Site or to the implementation of this Settlement, including, but not limited to, sampling, analysis, chain of custody records, manifests, trucking logs, receipts, reports, sample traffic routing, correspondence, or other documents or information regarding the Work (hereinafter referred to as "Records"). MGII shall also make available to EPA and the State, for purposes of investigation, information gathering, or testimony, their employees, agents, or representatives with knowledge of relevant facts concerning the performance of the Work.

46. Privileged and Protected Claims

a. MGII may assert all or part of a Record requested by EPA or the State is privileged or protected as provided under federal law, in lieu of providing the Record, provided MGII complies with Paragraph [INSERT], and except as provided in Paragraph [INSERT].

b. If MGII asserts such a privilege or protection, it shall provide EPA with the following information regarding such Record: its title; its date; the name, title, affiliation (*e.g.*, company or firm), and address of the author, of each addressee, and of each recipient; a description of the Record's contents; and the privilege or protection asserted. If a claim of privilege or protection applies only to a portion of a Record, MGII shall provide the Record to EPA and the State in redacted form to mask the privileged or protected portion only. MGII shall retain all Records that they claim to be privileged or protected until EPA and the State have had a reasonable opportunity to dispute the privilege or protection claim and any such dispute has been resolved in MGII's favor.

c. Except for Business Confidential Claims permitted in Paragraph [INSERT], MGII may make no claim of privilege or protection regarding: (1) any data,

other than non- environmental data, regarding the Site, including, but not limited to, all sampling, analytical, monitoring, hydrogeologic, scientific, chemical, radiological, or engineering data, or the portion of any other Record that evidences conditions at or around the Site; or (2) the portion of any Record that MGII is required to create or generate pursuant to this Settlement.

47. Business Confidential Claims. MGII may assert that all or part of a Record provided to EPA and the State under this Section or Section [INSERT] (Record Retention) is business confidential to the extent permitted by and in accordance with Section 104(e)(7) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9604(e)(7), and 40 C.F.R. § 2.203(b). MGI shall segregate and clearly identify all Records or parts thereof submitted under this Settlement for which MGII asserts business confidentiality claims. Records that MGI claims to be confidential business information will be afforded the protection specified in 40 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart B. If no claim of confidentiality accompanies Records when they are submitted to EPA and the State, or if EPA has notified MGII that the Records are not confidential under the standards of Section 104(e)(7) of CERCLA or 40 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart B, the public may be given access to such Records without further notice to MGII.

48. Notwithstanding any provision of this Settlement, EPA and the State retain all of their information gathering and inspection authorities and rights, including enforcement actions related thereto, under CERCLA, RCRA, and any other applicable statutes or regulations.

XI. RECORD RETENTION

49. Until ten (10) years after EPA provides MGII with notice, pursuant to Section [INSERT] (Notice of Completion of Work), that all Work has been fully performed in accordance with this Settlement, MGII shall preserve and retain all non-identical copies of Records (including Records in electronic form) now in their possession or control, or that come into their possession or control, that relate in any manner to MGII's representations of the BFPP provisions of CERCLA §§ 101(40)(A)-(H) and 107(r)(l), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 (40)(A)-(H) and 9607(r)(l) with regard to the Site, provided, however, that a party who is potentially liable as an owner or operator of the Site must retain, in addition, all Records that relate to the liability of any other person under CERCLA with respect to the Site. MGII must also retain, and instruct its contractors and agents to preserve, for the same period of time specified above all non-identical copies of the last draft or final version of any Records (including Records in electronic form) now in their possession or control or that come into their possession or control that relate in any manner to the performance of the Work, provided, however, that MGII (and its contractors and agents) must retain, in addition, copies of all data generated during the performance of the Work and not contained in the aforementioned Records required to be retained. Each of the above record retention requirements shall apply regardless of any corporate retention policy to the contrary.

50. At the conclusion of the document retention period, MGII shall notify EPA at least 90 days prior to the destruction of any such Records, and, upon request by

EPA, and except as provided in Paragraph [INSERT] (Privileged and Protected Claims), MGII shall deliver any such Records to EPA.

51. MGII certifies that, as of the Effective Date and to the best of its knowledge and belief, after thorough inquiry, it has not altered, mutilated, discarded, destroyed, or otherwise disposed of any Records (other than identical copies) relating to the Site and that it has fully complied with any and all EPA and State requests for information regarding the Site pursuant to Sections 104(e) and 122(e) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9604(e) and 9622(e), and Section 3007 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6927, and state law.

XII. COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER LAWS

52. Nothing in this Settlement limits MGII's obligations to comply with the requirements of all applicable state and federal laws and regulations, except as provided in Section 121(e) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9621(e), and 40 C.F.R. §§ 300.400(e) and 300.415(j). [In accordance with 40 C.F.R. § 300.415(j), all on-site actions required pursuant to this Settlement shall, to the extent practicable, as determined by EPA, considering the exigencies of the situation, attain applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) under federal environmental or state environmental or facility siting laws. MGII shall identify ARARs in the Work Plan subject to EPA approval.]

53. No local, state, or Federal permit shall be required for any portion of the Work conducted entirely on-site (*i.e.*, within the areal extent of contamination or in very close proximity to the contamination and necessary for implementation of the Work), including studies, if the action is selected and carried out in compliance with Section 121 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9621. Where any portion of the Work that is not on-site requires a federal or state permit or approval, MGII shall submit timely and complete applications and take all other actions necessary to obtain and to comply with all such permits or approvals. MGII may seek relief under the provisions of Section [INSERT] (Force Majeure) for any delay in the performance of the Work resulting from a failure to obtain, or a delay in obtaining, any permit or approval required for the Work, provided that they have submitted timely and complete applications and taken all other actions necessary to obtain all such permits or approvals. This Settlement is not, and shall not be construed to be, a permit issued pursuant to any federal or state statute or regulation.

XIII. EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND NOTIFICATION OF RELEASES

54. Emergency Response. If any event occurs during performance of the Work that causes or threatens to cause a release of Waste Material on, at, or from the Site that either constitutes an emergency situation or that may present an immediate threat to public health or welfare or the environment, MGII shall immediately take all appropriate action to prevent, abate, or minimize such release or threat of release. MGII shall take these actions in accordance with all applicable provisions of this Settlement, including, but not limited to, the Health and Safety Plan. MGII shall also immediately notify the RPM or, in the event of his/her unavailability, the Regional Duty Officer of the incident or Site conditions. The MGII shall also notify the State in accordance with Section

[INSERT] (Notices). In the event that MGII fails to take appropriate response action as required by this Paragraph, and EPA takes such action instead, MGII shall reimburse EPA for all costs of such response action not inconsistent with the NCP pursuant to Section [INSERT] (Payment of Future Response Costs).

55. Release Reporting. Upon the occurrence of any event during performance of the Work that MGII is required to report pursuant to Section 103 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9603, or Section 304 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA), 42 U.S.C. § 11004, MGII shall immediately orally notify the RPM or, in the event of his/her unavailability, the Regional Duty Officer at 303-293-1788, and the National Response Center at (800) 424-8802. This reporting requirement is in addition to, and not in lieu of, reporting under Section 103(c) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9603(c), and Section 304 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. § 11004.

56. For any event covered under this Section, MGII shall submit a written report to EPA within 7 days after the onset of such event, setting forth the action or event that occurred and the measures taken, and to be taken, to mitigate any release or threat of release or endangerment caused or threatened by the release and to prevent the reoccurrence of such a release or threat of release.

XIV. PAYMENT OF FUTURE RESPONSE COSTS

57. Payment of Sum for Future Response Costs. Within 60 days prior to commencing Work, MGII shall pay to EPA $ ____ for Oversight Costs.

a. Payment shall be made to EPA by Electronic Funds Transfer ("EFT") in accordance with current EFT procedures to be provided to MGII by EPA Region 10 and shall be accompanied by a statement identifying the name and address of MGII, the Site name, the EPA Region and Site/Spill ID Number ____, and the EPA docket number for this action.

b. The total amount to be paid by MGII pursuant to Paragraph [INSERT] shall be deposited by EPA in the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund.] [The total amount to be paid by MGII pursuant to [INSERT] shall be deposited by EPA in the [Site Name] Special Account within the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund to be retained and used to finance Oversight Costs.]

c. At the time of payment, MGII shall send notice that payment has been made to [insert names and mailing addresses of Regional Financial Officer and any other receiving officials at EPA.]

d. Return of Excess Sum Certain Oversight Cost Payment. After EPA issues its Notice of Completion pursuant to Section [INSERT] and has performed a final accounting of Oversight Costs, EPA shall remit and return to MGII any unused amount of the funds paid by MGII pursuant to Paragraph [INSERT] above.

58. Contesting Future Response Costs. MGII may initiate the procedures of Section [INSERT] (Dispute Resolution) regarding payment of any Future Response Costs billed under Paragraph [INSERT] (Payments of Sum for Future Response Costs) if it determines that EPA has made a mathematical error or included a cost item that is not within the definition of Future Response Costs, or if they believe EPA incurred excess costs as a direct result of an EPA action that was inconsistent with a specific provision or provisions of the NCP. To initiate such dispute, MGII shall submit a Notice of Dispute in writing to the RPM within 30 days after receipt of the bill. Any such Notice of Dispute shall specifically identify the contested Future Response Costs and the basis for objection. If MGII submits a Notice of Dispute, MGII shall within the 30-day period, also as a requirement for initiating the dispute, (a) pay all uncontested Future Response Costs to EPA in the manner described in Paragraph [INSERT], and (b) establish, in a duly chartered bank or trust company, an interest-bearing escrow account that is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and remit to that escrow account funds equivalent to the amount of the contested Future Response Costs. MGII shall send to the RPM a copy of the transmittal letter and check paying the uncontested Future Response Costs, and a copy of the correspondence that establishes and funds the escrow account, including, but not limited to, information containing the identity of the bank and bank account under which the escrow account is established as well as a bank statement showing the initial balance of the escrow account. If EPA prevails in the dispute, within 5 days after the resolution of the dispute, the escrow agent shall release the sums due (with accrued interest) to EPA in the manner described in Paragraph 52. If MGII prevails concerning any aspect of the contested costs, the escrow agent shall release that portion of the costs (plus associated accrued interest) for which they did not prevail to EPA in the manner described in Paragraph [INSERT]. MGII shall be disbursed any balance of the escrow account within 5 days after the resolution of the dispute. The dispute resolution procedures set forth in this Paragraph in conjunction with the procedures set forth in Section [INSERT] (Dispute Resolution) shall be the exclusive mechanisms for resolving disputes regarding MGII's obligation to reimburse EPA for its Future Response Costs.

XV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

59. Unless otherwise expressly provided for in this Settlement, the dispute resolution procedures of this Section shall be the exclusive mechanism for resolving disputes arising under this Settlement. The Parties shall attempt to resolve any disagreements concerning this Settlement expeditiously and informally.

60. Informal Dispute Resolution. If MGII objects to any EPA action taken pursuant to this Settlement, including providing Notice of Completion of Work or matters pertaining to Future Response Costs, it shall send EPA a written Notice of Dispute describing the objection(s) within 14 days after such action or MGII becoming aware of such action, whichever is later. EPA and MGII shall have 30 days from EPA's receipt of MGII's Notice of Dispute to resolve the dispute through informal negotiations (the Negotiation Period). The Negotiation Period may be extended at the sole discretion of EPA. Any agreement reached by the Parties pursuant to this Section shall be in writing and shall, upon signature by the Parties, be incorporated into and become an enforceable part of this Settlement.

61. Formal Dispute Resolution. If the Parties are unable to reach an agreement within the Negotiation Period, MGII shall, within 20 days after the end of the Negotiation Period, submit a statement of position to the RPM. EPA may, within 20 days thereafter, submit a statement of position. Thereafter, an EPA management official at the Supervisory level or higher will issue a written decision on the dispute to MGII. EPA's decision shall be incorporated into and become an enforceable part of this Settlement. MGII shall fulfill the requirement that was the subject of the dispute in accordance with the agreement reached or with EPA's decision, whichever occurs.

62. Except as provided in Paragraph [INSERT] (Contesting Future Response Costs) or as agreed by EPA, the invocation of formal dispute resolution procedures under this Section does not extend, postpone, or affect in any way any obligation of MGII under this Settlement. Except as provided in Paragraph [INSERT], stipulated penalties with respect to the disputed matter shall continue to accrue, but payment shall be stayed pending resolution of the dispute. Notwithstanding the stay of payment, stipulated penalties shall accrue from the first day of noncompliance with any applicable provision of this Settlement. In the event that MGII does not prevail on the disputed issue, stipulated penalties shall be assessed and paid as provided in Section [INSERT] (Stipulated Penalties).

XVI. FORCE MAJEURE

63. "Force Majeure" for purposes of this Settlement, is defined as any event arising from causes beyond the control of MGII, of any entity controlled by MGII, or of MGII's contractors that delays or prevents the performance of any obligation under this Settlement despite MGII's best efforts to fulfill the obligation. The requirement that MGII exercise "best efforts to fulfill the obligation" includes using best efforts to anticipate any potential force majeure and best efforts to address the effects of any potential force majeure (a) as it is occurring and (b) following the potential force majeure such that the delay and any adverse effects of the delay are minimized to the greatest extent possible. "Force majeure" does not include financial inability to complete the Work or increased cost of performance.

64. If any event occurs or has occurred that may delay the performance of any obligation under this Settlement for which MGII intends or may intend to assert a claim of force majeure, MGII shall notify EPA's RPM orally or, in their absence, EPA Region 10, within 10 days of when MGII first knew that the event might cause a delay. Within 5 days thereafter, MGII shall provide in writing to EPA an explanation and description of the reasons for the delay; the anticipated duration of the delay; all actions taken or to be taken to prevent or minimize the delay; a schedule for implementation of any measures to be taken to prevent or mitigate the delay or the effect of the delay; MGII's rationale for attributing such delay to a force majeure; and a statement as to whether, in the opinion of MGII, such event may cause or contribute to an endangerment to public health or welfare, or the environment. MGII shall include with any notice all available documentation supporting their claim that the delay was attributable to a force majeure. MGII shall be deemed to know of any circumstance of which MGII, any entity controlled by MGII, or MGII's contractors knew or should have known. Failure to comply with the

above requirements regarding an event shall preclude MGII from asserting any claim of force majeure regarding that event, provided, however, that if EPA, despite the late or incomplete notice, is able to assess to its satisfaction whether the event is a force majeure under Paragraph [INSERT] and whether MGII has exercised their best efforts under Paragraph [INSERT], EPA may, in its unreviewable discretion, excuse in writing MGII's failure to submit timely or complete notices under this Paragraph.

65. If EPA agrees that the delay or anticipated delay is attributable to a force majeure, the time for performance of the obligations under this Settlement that are affected by the force majeure will be extended by EPA for such time as is necessary to complete those obligations. An extension of the time for performance of the obligations affected by the force majeure shall not, of itself, extend the time for performance of any other obligation. If EPA does not agree that the delay or anticipated delay has been or will be caused by a force majeure, EPA will notify MGII in writing of its decision. If EPA agrees that the delay is attributable to a force majeure, EPA will notify MGII in writing of the length of the extension, if any, for performance of the obligations affected by the force majeure.

66. If MGII elects to invoke the dispute resolution procedures set forth in Section [INSERT] (Dispute Resolution), it shall do so no later than 15 days after receipt of EPA's notice. In any such proceeding, MGII shall have the burden of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence that the delay or anticipated delay has been or will be caused by a force majeure, that the duration of the delay or the extension sought was or will be warranted under the circumstances, that best efforts were exercised to avoid and mitigate the effects of the delay, and that MGII complied with the requirements of Paragraphs [INSERT]. If MGII carries this burden, the delay at issue shall be deemed not to be a violation by MGII of the affected obligation of this Settlement identified to EPA.

67. The failure by EPA to timely complete any obligation under the Settlement is not a violation of the Settlement, provided, however, that if such failure prevents MGII from meeting one or more deadlines under the Settlement, MGII may seek relief under this Section.

XVII. CERTIFICATION

68. By entering into this Settlement, MGII certifies that to the best of its knowledge and belief it has fully and accurately disclosed to EPA as well as the lead and cooperating Federal agencies involved in approving the PRO all material information known to MGII, MGC, IGRC and SGC and all material information in the possession or control of its officers, directors, employees, contractors and agents which relates in any way to any Existing Contamination or any past or potential release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants at or from the Site and to its qualification for this Settlement. MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC and SGC also certify that to the best of their knowledge and belief it has not caused or contributed to a release or threat of release of hazardous substances or pollutants or contaminants at the Site. MGII further certifies to the representations made under Paragraph 3.

XVIII. COVENANTS BY UNITED STATES AND THE STATE

69. Except as provided in Section [INSERT] (Reservations of Rights by United States), the United States and the State covenants not to sue or to take administrative action against MGII pursuant to Sections 106 or 107(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9606 and 9607(a), for the Work, Existing Contamination, and Future Response Costs. These covenants shall take effect upon the Effective Date. These covenants are conditioned upon the complete and satisfactory performance by MGII of their obligations under this Settlement. These covenants are also conditioned upon the veracity of the information provided to EPA by MGII relating to MGII's Work at the Site and the certification made by MGII in Paragraph [INSERT]. This covenant extends only to MGII and does not extend to any other person.

70. Nothing in this Settlement constitutes a covenant not to sue or to take action or otherwise limits the ability of the United States, including EPA, or the State to seek or obtain further relief from MGII, if the information provided to EPA by MGII relating to MGII's Work at the Site, or the certification made by MGII in Paragraph [INSERT], is false or in any material respect, inaccurate.

XIX. RESERVATIONS OF RIGHTS BY UNITED STATES AND THE STATE

71. Except as specifically provided in this Settlement, nothing in this Settlement shall limit the power and authority of the United States and/or the State to take, direct, or order all actions necessary to protect public health, welfare, or the environment or to prevent, abate, or minimize an actual or threatened release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants, or hazardous or solid waste on, at, or from the Site. Further, except as specifically provided in this Settlement, nothing in this Settlement shall prevent the United States and/or the State from seeking legal or equitable relief to enforce the terms of this Settlement, from taking other legal or equitable action as it deems appropriate and necessary.

72. The covenants set forth in Section [INSERT] (Covenants by the United States and the State) do not pertain to any matters other than those expressly identified therein. The United States and the State reserve, and this Settlement is without prejudice to, all rights against MGII with respect to all other matters, including, but not limited to:

a. liability for failure by MGII to meet a requirement of this Settlement;

b. criminal liability;

c. liability for violations of federal or state law that occur during or after implementation of the Work;

d. liability for damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources, and for the costs of any natural resource damage assessments;

e. liability resulting from the release or threat of release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants at or in connection with the Site after the Effective Date, not within the definition of Existing Contamination;

f. liability resulting from exacerbation of Existing Contamination not associated with the Work by MGII, its successors and assigns; and

g. liability arising from the disposal, release or threat of release of Waste Materials outside of the Site.

73. With respect to any claim or cause of action asserted by the United States, MGII shall bear the burden of proving that the claim or cause of action, or any part thereof, is attributable solely to Existing Contamination and that MGII has complied with all of the requirements of 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 (40)(A)-(H) and 9607(r)(l).

74. Work Takeover

a. In the event EPA determines that MGII: (1) has ceased implementation of any portion of the Work, (2) is seriously or repeatedly deficient or late in its performance of the Work, or (3) is implementing the Work in a manner which may cause an endangerment to human health or the environment, EPA may issue a written notice (Work Takeover Notice) to MGII. Any Work Takeover Notice issued by EPA (which writing may be electronic) will specify the grounds upon which such notice was issued and will provide MGII a period of 15 days within which to remedy the circumstances giving rise to EPA's issuance of such notice.

b. If, after expiration of the 15-day notice period specified in Paragraph [INSERT] MGII has not remedied or begun to remedy to EPA's satisfaction the circumstances giving rise to EPA's issuance of the relevant Work Takeover Notice, EPA may at any time thereafter assume the performance of all or any portion(s) of the Work as EPA deems necessary (Work Takeover). EPA will notify MGII in writing (which writing may be electronic) if EPA determines that implementation of a Work Takeover is warranted under this Paragraph [INSERT].

c. MGII may invoke the procedures set forth in Section [INSERT] (Formal Dispute Resolution) to dispute EPA's implementation of a Work Takeover under Paragraph [INSERT]. However, notwithstanding MGII invocation of such dispute resolution procedures, and during the pendency of any such dispute, EPA may in its sole discretion commence and continue a Work Takeover under Paragraph [INSERT] until the earlier of (1) the date that MGII remedies, to EPA 's satisfaction, the circumstances giving rise to EPA's issuance of the relevant Work Takeover Notice, or (2) the date that a written decision terminating such Work Takeover is rendered in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT] (Formal Dispute Resolution).

d. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Settlement, EPA retains all authority and reserves all rights to take any and all response actions authorized by law.

XX. COVENANTS BY MGII

75. MGII covenants not to sue and agrees not to assert any claims or causes of action against the State, the United States, or its contractors or employees, with respect to Existing Contamination, the Work, Future Response Costs, and this Settlement, including, but not limited to:

a. any direct or indirect claim for reimbursement from the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund through Sections 106(b)(2), 107, 111, 112, or 113 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9606(b)(2), 9607, 9611, 9612, or 9613, or any other provision of law;

b. any claim arising out of response actions at or in connection with the Site, including any claim under the United States Constitution, the State of Idaho Constitution, the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491, the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, or at common law; or

c. any claim pursuant to Sections 107 and 113 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9607 and 9613, Section 7002(a) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a), or state law regarding, the Work, Future Response Costs, and this Settlement.

76. These covenants not to sue shall not apply in the event the United States brings a cause of action or issues an order pursuant to any of the reservations set forth in Section [INSERT] (Reservations of Rights by the United States and the State), other than in Paragraph [INSERT] (liability for failure to meet a requirement of the Settlement), 77.b (criminal liability), or [INSERT] (violations of federal/state law during or after implementation of the Work), but only to the extent that MGII's claims arise from the same response action, response costs, or damages that the United States is seeking pursuant to the applicable reservation.

77. Nothing in this Settlement shall be deemed to constitute approval or preauthorization of a claim within the meaning of Section 111 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9611, or 40 C.F.R. § 300.700(d).

78. MGII reserves, and this Settlement is without prejudice to, claims against the United States, subject to the provisions of Chapter 171 of Title 28 of the United States Code, and brought pursuant to any statute other than CERCLA or RCRA and for which the waiver of sovereign immunity is found in a statute other than CERCLA or RCRA, for money damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the United States, as that term is defined in 28 U.S.C. § 2671, while acting within the scope of his or her office or employment under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. However, the foregoing shall not include any claim based on EPA's selection of response actions, or the oversight or approval of MGII's deliverables or activities.

79. MGII reserves, and this Settlement is without prejudice to, arguments that any claim or cause of action, or part thereof, is attributable solely to Existing

Contamination and that MGII has complied with all of the requirements of 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601(40)(A)-(H) and 9607(r)(l).

XXI. OTHER CLAIMS

80. By issuance of this Settlement, the United States, the State, and EPA assume no liability for injuries or damages to persons or property resulting from any acts or omissions of MGII. The United States, the State, and EPA shall not be deemed a party to any contract entered into by MGII or its directors, officers, employees, agents, successors, representatives, assigns, contractors, or consultants in carrying out actions pursuant to this Settlement.

81. Except as expressly provided in Section [INSERT] (Covenants by the United States and the State), nothing in this Settlement constitutes a satisfaction of or release from any claim or cause of action against MGII or any person not a party to this Settlement, for any liability such person may have under CERCLA, other statutes, or common law, including but not limited to any claims of the United States for costs, damages, and interest under Sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9606 and 9607.

82. No action or decision by EPA pursuant to this Settlement shall give rise to any right to judicial review, except as set forth in Section 113(h) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(h).

XXII. EFFECT OF SETTLEMENT/CONTRIBUTION

83. Nothing in this Settlement shall be construed to create any rights in, or grant any cause of action to, any person not a Party to this Settlement. Except as provided in Section [INSERT] (Covenants by MGII), each of the Parties expressly reserves any and all rights (including, but not limited to, pursuant to Section 113 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613), defenses, claims, demands, and causes of action which each Party may have with respect to any matter, transaction, or occurrence relating in any way to the Site against any person not a Party hereto. Nothing herein diminishes the right of the United States, pursuant to Sections 113(f)(2) and (3) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f)(2) and (3), to pursue any such persons to obtain additional response costs or response actions and to enter into settlements that give rise to contribution protection pursuant to Section 113(f)(2).

84. If a suit or claim for contribution is brought against MGII with respect to Existing Contamination (including any claim based on the contention that MGII is liable as a result of response actions taken in compliance with this Settlement or at the direction of EPA's RPM), the Parties agree that this Settlement constitutes an administrative settlement pursuant to which MGII has, as of the Effective Date, resolved liability to the United States within the meaning of Sections 113(f)(2) and 122(h)(4) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C.§§ 9613(f)(2) and 9622(h)(4), and is entitled, as of the Effective Date, to protection from contribution actions or claims as provided by Sections 113(f)(2) and 122(h)(4) of CERCLA, or as may be otherwise provided by law, for the "matters

addressed" in this Settlement. The "matters addressed" in this Settlement are the Work, Existing Contamination, and Future Response Costs.

85. MGII shall, with respect to any suit or claim brought by it for matters related to this Settlement, notify EPA in writing no later than sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of such suit or claim. MGII shall, with respect to any suit or claim brought against it for matters related to this Settlement, notify EPA in writing within ten (10) days after service of the complaint or claim upon it. In addition, MGII shall notify EPA within ten (10) days after service or receipt of any Motion for Summary Judgment and within ten (10) days after receipt of any order from a court setting a case for trial, for matters related to this Settlement.

XXIII. INDEMNIFICATION

86. The United States and the State do not assume any liability by entering into this Settlement or by virtue of any designation of MGII as EPA's authorized representatives under Section 104(e) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9604(e), and 40 C.F.R. 300.400(d)(3). MGII shall indemnify, save, and hold harmless the United States and the State, their officials, agents, employees, contractors, subcontractors, and representatives for or from any and all claims or causes of action arising from, or on account of, negligent or other wrongful acts or omissions of MGII, their officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, or subcontractors, and any persons acting on MGII's behalf or under their control, in carrying out activities pursuant to this Settlement. Further, MGII agrees to pay the United States all costs it incurs, including but not limited to attorneys' fees and other expenses of litigation and settlement arising from, or on account of, claims made against the United States based on negligent or other wrongful acts or omissions of MGII, their officers, directors, employees, agents, contractors, subcontractors, and any persons acting on their behalf or under their control, in carrying out activities pursuant to this Settlement. The United States and the State shall not be held out as a party to any contract entered into by or on behalf of MGII in carrying out activities pursuant to this Settlement. Neither MGII nor any such contractor shall be considered an agent of the United States or the State.

87. The United States shall give MGII notice of any claim for which the United States plans to seek indemnification pursuant to this Section and shall consult with MGII prior to settling such claim.

88. MGII covenants not to sue and agree not to assert any claims or causes of action against the United States or the State for damages or reimbursement or for set-off of any payments made or to be made to the United States or the State, arising from or on account of any contract, agreement, or arrangement between any one or more of MGII and any person for performance of Work on or relating to the Site, including, but not limited to, claims on account of construction delays.

89. In addition, MGII shall indemnify and hold harmless the United States and the State with respect to any and all claims for damages or reimbursement arising from or on account of any contract, agreement, or arrangement between MGII and any person for

performance of Work on or relating to the Site, including, but not limited to, claims on account of construction delays.

XXIV. INSURANCE

90. No later than 14 days before commencing any on-site Work, MGII shall secure, and shall maintain until the first anniversary after issuance of Notice of Completion of Work pursuant to Section [INSERT] (Notice of Completion of Work), commercial general liability insurance with limits of $1 million per occurrence, and automobile liability insurance with limits of liability of $1 million per accident, and umbrella liability insurance with limits of liability of $5 million in excess of the required commercial general liability and automobile liability limits, naming EPA as an additional insured with respect to all liability arising out of the activities performed by or on behalf of MGII pursuant to this Settlement. In addition, for the duration of the Settlement, MGII shall provide EPA with certificates of such insurance and a copy of each insurance policy. MGII shall resubmit such certificates and copies of policies each year on the anniversary of the Effective Date. In addition, for the duration of the Settlement, MGII shall satisfy, or shall ensure that their contractors or subcontractors satisfy, all applicable laws and regulations regarding the provision of worker's compensation insurance for all persons performing the Work on behalf of MGII in furtherance of this Settlement. If MGII demonstrates by evidence satisfactory to EPA that any contractor or subcontractor maintains insurance equivalent to that described above, or insurance covering some or all of the same risks but in a lesser amount, MGII need provide only that portion of the insurance described above that is not maintained by the contractor or subcontractor. MGII shall ensure that all submittals to EPA under this Paragraph identify the Stibnite Mine Site name and the EPA docket number for this action.

XXV. FINANCIAL ASSURANCE [TO BE REVIEWED TO CONSOLIDATE WITH STATE AND USFS FINANCIAL ASSURANCE AND AVOID DUPLICATION]

91. In order to ensure completion of the Work, MGII shall secure financial assurance, initially in the amount of $[INSERT] (Estimated Cost of the Work), [for the benefit of EPA.] The financial assurance must be one or more of the mechanisms listed below, in a form substantially identical to the relevant sample documents available from the "Financial Assurance" category on the Cleanup Enforcement Model Language and Sample Documents Database at https://cfpub.epa.gov/compliance/models/, and satisfactory to EPA. MGII may use multiple mechanisms if they are limited to surety bonds guaranteeing payment, letters of credit, trust funds, and/or insurance policies.

a. A surety bond guaranteeing payment and/or performance of the Work that is issued by a surety company among those listed as acceptable sureties on federal bonds as set forth in Circular 570 of the U.S. Department of the Treasury;

b. An irrevocable letter of credit, payable to or at the direction of EPA, that is issued by an entity that has the authority to issue letters of credit and whose letter-of-credit operations are regulated and examined by a federal or state agency;

c. A trust fund established for the benefit of EPA that is administered by a trustee that has the authority to act as a trustee and whose trust operations are regulated and examined by a federal or state agency; [BOOKMARK FOR DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE FOR RECLAMATION SECURITY TRUST/QUALIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST W/EPA, STATE AND USFS AS BENEFICIARIES]

d. A policy of insurance that provides EPA with acceptable rights as a beneficiary thereof and that is issued by an insurance carrier that has the authority to issue insurance policies in the applicable jurisdiction(s) and whose insurance operations are regulated and examined by a federal or state agency;

92. MGII shall submit such mechanisms and documents to the Regional financial assurance specialist at the following address:

[INSERT]

93. MGII shall diligently monitor the adequacy of the financial assurance. If MGII becomes aware of any information indicating that the financial assurance provided under this Section is inadequate or otherwise no longer satisfies the requirements of this Section, such MGII shall notify EPA of such information within 7 days. If EPA determines that the financial assurance provided under this Section is inadequate or otherwise no longer satisfies the requirements of this Section, EPA will notify the MGII of such determination. MGII shall, within 30 days after notifying EPA or receiving notice from EPA under this Paragraph, secure and submit to EPA for approval a proposal for a revised or alternative financial assurance mechanism that satisfies the requirements of this Section. EPA may extend this deadline for such time as is reasonably necessary for the MGII, in the exercise of due diligence, to secure and submit to EPA a proposal for a revised or alternative financial assurance mechanism, not to exceed 60 days. MGII shall follow the procedures of Paragraph 98 (Modification of Amount, Form, or Terms of Financial Assurance) in seeking approval of, and submitting documentation for, the revised or alternative financial assurance mechanism. MGII's inability to secure and submit to EPA financial assurance in accordance with this Section shall in no way excuse performance of any other requirements of this Settlement, including, without limitation, the obligation of MGII to complete the Work in accordance with the terms of this Settlement.

94. Access to Financial Assurance.

a. If EPA issues a notice of implementation of a Work Takeover under Paragraph [INSERT], then, in accordance with any applicable financial assurance mechanism, EPA is entitled to: (1) the performance of the Work; and/or (2) require that any funds guaranteed be paid in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT].

b. If EPA is notified by the issuer of a financial assurance mechanism that it intends to cancel such mechanism, and the MGII fails to provide an alternative financial assurance mechanism in accordance with this Section at least 30 days prior to

the cancellation date, the funds guaranteed under such mechanism must be paid prior to cancellation in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT].

c. If, upon issuance of a notice of implementation of a Work Takeover under Paragraph [INSERT], either: (1) EPA is unable for any reason to promptly secure the resources guaranteed under any applicable financial assurance mechanism, whether in cash or in kind, to continue and complete the Work; or (2) the financial assurance is provided under Paragraph [INSERT], then EPA may demand an amount, as determined by EPA, sufficient to cover the cost of the remaining Work to be performed. MGII shall, within 7 days of such demand, pay the amount demanded as directed by EPA.

d. Any amounts required to be paid under this Paragraph shall be, as directed by EPA: (i) paid to EPA in order to facilitate the completion of the Work by EPA or by another person; or (ii) deposited into an interest-bearing account, established at a duly chartered bank or trust company that is insured by the FDIC, in order to facilitate the completion of the Work by another person. If payment is made to EPA, EPA may deposit the payment into the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund or into the Stibnite Mine Site Special Account within the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund to be retained and used to conduct or finance response actions at or in connection with the Site, or to be transferred by EPA to the EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund.

e. All EPA Work Takeover costs, not inconsistent with the NCP, and not paid under this Paragraph must be reimbursed as Future Response Costs under Section [INSERT] (Payments for Response Costs).

95. Modification of Amount, Form, or Terms of Financial Assurance. MGII may submit, on any anniversary of the Effective Date or at any other time agreed to by the Parties, a request to reduce the amount, or change the form or terms, of the financial assurance mechanism. Any such request must be submitted to EPA in accordance with Paragraph 99 and must include an estimate of the cost of the remaining Work, an explanation of the bases for the cost calculation, and a description of the proposed changes, if any, to the form or terms of the financial assurance. EPA will notify MGII of its decision to approve or disapprove a requested reduction or change pursuant to this Paragraph. MGII may reduce the amount of the financial assurance mechanism only in accordance with: (a) EPA's approval; or (b) if there is a dispute, the agreement or written decision resolving such dispute under Section [INSERT] (Dispute Resolution). Any decision made by EPA on a request submitted under this Paragraph to change the form or terms of a financial assurance mechanism shall be made in EPA's sole and unreviewable discretion, and such decision shall not be subject to challenge by MGII pursuant to the dispute resolution provisions of this Settlement or in any other forum. Within 30 days after receipt of EPA's approval of, or the agreement or decision resolving a dispute relating to, the requested modifications pursuant to this Paragraph, MGII shall submit to EPA documentation of the reduced, revised, or alternative financial assurance mechanism in accordance with Paragraph [INSERT].

96. Release. Cancellation, or Discontinuation of Financial Assurance. MGII may release, cancel, or discontinue any financial assurance provided under this Section only: (a) if EPA issues a Notice of Completion of Work under Section XXVIII (Notice of Completion of Work); (b) in accordance with EPA's approval of such release, cancellation, or discontinuation; or (c) if there is a dispute regarding the release, cancellation, or discontinuance of any financial assurance, in accordance with the agreement or final decision resolving such dispute under Section XV (Dispute Resolution).

XXVI. MODIFICATION

97. EPA's RPM may modify any plan or schedule or the SOW in writing or by oral direction. Any modification will not be arbitrary and capricious and will be of fair cost. Any oral modification will be memorialized in writing by EPA promptly, but shall have as its effective date the date of the RPM's oral direction. Any modification will be subject to modification that may be required of the PRO or other agency authorization for the Work concerned. Any other requirements of this Settlement may be modified in writing by mutual agreement of the Parties.

98. If MGII seeks permission to deviate from any approved Work Plan or schedule or the SOW, MGII's Project Coordinator shall submit a written request to EPA for approval outlining the proposed modification and its basis. MGII may not proceed with the requested deviation until receiving oral or written approval from EPA's RPM pursuant to Paragraph [INSERT].

99. No informal advice, guidance, suggestion, or comment by the RPM or other EPA representatives regarding any deliverable submitted by MGII shall relieve MGII of its obligation to obtain any formal approval required by this Settlement, or to comply with all requirements of this Settlement, unless it is formally modified.

XXVII. NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF WORK

100. When EPA, in consultation with the State, determines, after review of the Final Report, that all Work has been fully performed in accordance with this Settlement, with the exception of any continuing obligations required by this Settlement, EPA will provide written notice to MGII. If EPA determines that any such Work has not been completed in accordance with this Settlement, EPA will notify MGII, provide a list of the deficiencies, and require that MGII modify the Work Plans if appropriate in order to correct such deficiencies. MGII shall implement the modified and approved Work Plans and shall submit a modified Final Report in accordance with the EPA notice. Failure by MGII to implement the approved modified Work Plan shall be a violation of this Settlement.

XXVIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

101. This Settlement shall be subject to a thirty (30) day public comment period, after which EPA may modify or withdraw its consent to this Settlement if

comments received disclose facts or considerations which indicate that this Settlement is inappropriate, improper or inadequate.

XXIX. INTEGRATION/APPENDICES

102. This Settlement and its appendices constitute the final, complete, and exclusive agreement and understanding among the Parties with respect to the settlement embodied in this Settlement. The Parties acknowledge that there are no representations, agreements, or understandings relating to the settlement other than those expressly contained in this Settlement. The following appendices are attached to and incorporated into this Settlement.

a. Appendix A is a map of the Site.

b. Appendix B is the SOW.

XXX. EFFECTIVE DATE

103. The effective date of this Settlement shall be the date upon which EPA issues written notice to MGII that EPA has fully executed the Settlement after review of and response to any public comments received. If, by the time EPA issues such notice to MGII, and MGII has not yet had its Plan of Restoration and Operation approved by the United States Forest Service through a record of decision (ROD), the effective date of this Settlement shall be the date upon which MGII receives final approval by the Forest Service for the Plan of Restoration and Operations through a ROD.

104. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Settlement, EPA agrees that the performance obligations under this Settlement cannot proceed in the absence of applicable required permits and other authorizations issued by the appropriate government agencies.

XXXI. DISCLAIMER

105. This Settlement in no way constitutes a finding by EPA as to the risks to human health and the environment which may be posed by contamination at the Site nor constitutes any representation by EPA that the Site is fit for any particular purpose.

XXXII. NOTICES AND SUBMISSIONS

106. Any notices, documents, information, reports, plans, approvals, disapprovals, or other correspondence required to be submitted from one party to another under this Settlement, shall be deemed submitted either when an email is transmitted and received, it is hand-delivered or as of the date of receipt by certified mail/return receipt requested, express mail, or facsimile.

Submissions to MGII shall be addressed to:

With copies to:

and

Submissions to MGC shall be addressed to:

Submissions to IGRCLLC shall be addressed to:

Submissions to SGC shall be addressed to:

All submissions to U.S. EPA shall be addressed to:

With electronic copies to:

All submissions to the State shall be addressed to:

With electronic copies to

IT IS SO AGREED:
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BY:

_____

_____

IT IS SO AGREED:
STATE OF IDAHO
BY:

_____

_____

The undersigned representative of MGII certifies that it is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Settlement and to bind the party it represents to this document.

IT IS SO AGREED:
BY:

_____

Name (MGII) Date

The undersigned representative of MGC certifies that it is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Settlement and to bind the party it represents to this document.

IT IS SO AGREED:
BY:

_____

Name (MGC) Date

The undersigned representative of IGRC LLC certifies that it is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Settlement and to bind the party it represents to this document.

IT IS SO AGREED:
BY:

_____

Name (IGRCLLC) Date

The undersigned representative of SGC certifies that it is fully authorized to enter into the terms and conditions of this Settlement and to bind the party it represents to this document.

IT IS SO AGREED:
BY:

_____

Name (SGC) Date

Dated this ____ day of [INSERT].

By:_____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the following parties listed below by United States mail, postage prepaid, this ___ day of _____, [INSERT].

APPENDIX A

PROJECT SITE




Legend
Streams
Surface Water Diversion
Rapid Infiltration Basin Area
Growth Media Stockpile
Borrow/Reclamation Area
Patented Property Boundary
N
North Gate
West End Open Pit
Yellow Pine Open Pit & Development Rock Storage Facility
West End Development Rock Storage Facility
EFSFSR Tunnel
Radio Communications Tower
Fiddle Development Rock Storage Facility
Site Landfill
Process Plant Area
TSF #4 Footprint
Underground Exploration & Explosives Storage Area
Hangar Flats Open Pit
Truck Shop Area
Main Gate
EF Meadow Creek (Blowout Creek) Realignment
Stibnite Lodge
Tailings Storage Facility
Main Access Road to Cascade (Burntlog Route)
Hangar Flats Development Rock Storage Facility

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF WORK
REMOVAL AND RESTORATION ACTIONS FOR STIBNITE MINE SITE

I. PURPOSE

The purpose and objective of the work described by this Statement of Work is to undertake Site response activity in areas of previous contamination while the Plan of Restoration and Operations is executed by MGII as the Stibnite Project Operator.

Further details of work activities, including the sequencing of actions, will be included in work plans that will be approved by the [RPM] in consultation with the Project Coordinator.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

A. SODA Area

1. Bradley Tailings Removal

(1) Approximately 3.5 million tons of legacy tailings in the SODA Area will be removed from their historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek Valley to be reprocessed and disposed of within the tailings storage facility (TSF).

(2) Approximately 10.5 million tons of legacy spent ore in the SODA will be removed from their historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek Valley to be reused in the construction of the TSF dam.

Removal of the materials, which are currently in stored in an unconstrained and unlined valley fill, and reprocessing and reuse, as appropriate, of these materials will improve water quality in Meadow Creek where legacy metals loading in to the creek is present and would minimize the need to excavate new material for construction purposes.

The Hecla Heap leach area will be disturbed in order to develop TSF construction material, beginning with Hangar Flats Pit development. The removal activity will require actions related to a buried mill, smelter waste, tailings removal and heap leach wastes and possibly management of potential contaminated water effluent from the former underground mine portals.

2. Stream Diversion

Construction of the TSF in the Meadow Creek valley requires diverting the stream around the TSF to protect water quality and manage runoff. The diversion will intercept water from upstream drainages, seeps and springs, and includes a lined channel capable of passing high flows during snow melt runoff and keeping water from reaching the TSF. Approximately 21,000 linear-feet (LF) of diversion channel will be constructed initially to capture the flow from both sides of the drainage.

Meadow Creek must be diverted around the south side of Hangar Flats Pit to enable mining the Hangar Flats mineral resource. Early in operations and prior to mining the portion of the Hangar Flats Pit below the valley bottom, Meadow Creek would be diverted around the Hangar Flats pit in a meandering channel similar to the previously-constructed Meadow Creek channel, but with a more favorable gradient (1-2%) for Chinook salmon spawning. A low permeability liner would be provided under the stream bed material to prevent loss of water into the adjacent pit. The reconstructed channel is intended to provide optimal spawning habitat during operations for running Chinook salmon that will be able to naturally access Meadow Creek (via the future Yellow Pine Tunnel) for the first time since 1938, and permanently via a newly-created surface channel on the closure of the Yellow Pine Pit.

B. Yellow Pine Pit Area

1. Draining and Excavation of the Yellow Pine Pit

Drainage of the existing Yellow Pine Pit Lake will require response to contaminated sediment and debris in former open pit, as well as closure and stabilization of old portals (Monday, Cinnabar, and former Bradley Mining Company workings). Excavation of the Pit for mining will disturb hazardous substances and removal will include control actions for runoff, seepage and fugitive dust.

2. Stream Diversion

During the construction of the Tunnel (see below), the East Fork South Fork Salmon River (EFSFSR), Hennessy Creek, and other seeps and springs must be diverted around the perimeter of the Yellow Pine Pit in order to protect water quality and prevent water from filling the Pit during operations. Additionally, a former subsurface diversion of Hennessy Creek will be reclaimed. Response action will include controls for potential groundwater impacts for as-yet uncharacterized metals in legacy areas.

3. East Fork South Fork Salmon River Tunnel Installation

The existing legacy Yellow Pine pit was mined from the 1930s through the 1950s. Following diversion of the EFSFSR into a ditch in 1938 and later into a diversion tunnel in 1942, the anadromous fish passage was blocked, initially due to the nature of the diversion features and, following closure of the tunnel, from the EFSFSR flowing into the Yellow Pine pit over the steep slopes of the south rim of the pit.

During the construction period, the EFSFSR will be relocated from its current location within the Yellow Pine Pit, where a steep segment upstream of the existing pit lake has prevented upstream fish passage since approximately 1938. The EFSFSR will be diverted through a tunnel (.8 miles long, "Tunnel") capable of protecting water quality and providing fish passage from the EFSFSR below the Yellow Pine Pit to reaches of the EFSFSR above the Yellow Pine Pit to its headwaters and to Meadow Creek. The Tunnel will be designed with engineered fish-friendly features so as to mimic natural habitat including lighting and resting pools, among others. A natural channel will be restored upon closure and restoration of the Yellow Pine Pit and select fish habitat enhancement projects between the Yellow Pine Pit and the confluence with Meadow Creek will be implemented as well as upstream of the confluence to the headwaters of the EFSFSR.

Construction activities will remove, as encountered, portions of legacy rock dumps that presently lie directly atop and adjacent to the banks of the EFSFSR and other potentially-contaminated material from the EFSFSR Valley.

C. Plant Site Area

During the construction of the Tunnel, construction will require removal of contamination of the former Monday Camp shops, as well as the crusher buildings and will require management of seepage and runoff from various development rock storage facility (DRSF) and former ore stockpiles. The removal activity will also require stabilization of former underground portals.

D. West End Area

Development of the West End Open Pit and the West End DRSF will necessarily encounter contaminated legacy areas.

1. West End Creek Diversion

West End Creek has been heavily impacted by legacy mining and mining-related activities, including development rock deposition over the stream channel, diversion of the stream into a French drain, and mining out of portions of the stream channel. West End Creek will be temporarily diverted around the West End pit and West End DRSF during operations. Diverting West End Creek away from the historical West End development rock dumps will improve water quality and prevent clean runoff from entering the West End Pit.

2. West End Pit Lake

The West End pit will be mined until the end of operations; however, wetland mitigation projects in and adjacent to the pit may run concurrently with the final phases of mining. Wetlands on benches around the perimeter of the West End Pit Lake will be created to provide a stable spillway channel through the historical development rock dump downstream of the lake outlet.

E. Blowout Creek (East Fork Meadow Creek) Restoration and Enhancement

Blowout Creek (East Fork Meadow Creek) has been severely impacted as a result of legacy mining-related activities and by the subsequent failure of the legacy water dam that had been constructed across its stream channel. Blowout Creek will be rehabilitated to control sediment from the incised and eroded stream regions, which is the single largest source of sediment, to the EFSFSR). As a part of its construction and operation activities, a phased approach to address the multiple environmental impacts associated with the 1965 failure of the Blowout Creek water reservoir will be undertaken.

A French Drain will be constructed in the main erosional gully feature, which is a major sediment contribution source for the basin. This constructed drain would convey that portion of Blowout Creek and disconnect erosional areas from the main stream, with the intent of controlling the ongoing erosion of the channel banks. Features near the old dam location to raise the Blowout Creek Valley water table to enhance the existing wetlands in the valley will be constructed in order to restore the pre-reservoir hydrologic conditions to support substantially

enhanced wetlands and riparian features in the upper Blowout Creek Valley. The base level will be raised to prevent further head-cutting and bank erosion in Blowout Creek upstream of the former dam site. Incised and eroded stream segments in the upper meadow will be improved to accelerate the natural channel recovery processes that are supported by the restored, higher base level.

F. Fiddle Creek Area

Fiddle Creek is currently cut off from the EFSFSR as a result of legacy mining operations, road construction and culvert installation. In addition, the drainage was the site of a legacy water storage reservoir that has left portions of the drainage in an unnatural state.

As a part of construction, Fiddle Creek will be diverted around the perimeter of the DRSF in a channel to protect water quality and prevent surface water from running onto the DRSF. Response action will be taken for the former north tunnel DRSF, and removal could require possible closure, stabilization of old portal and clean-up of the quarry site.

G. Other

[PLACEHOLDER FOR OTHER REMOVAL ACTIONS IF NECESSARY, SUCH AS NECESSARY INFRASTRUCTURE DISTURBANCES ON OR AROUND LEGACY AREAS]

EXHIBIT 5

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

L. Michael Bogert

From: Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 11:39 AM
To: L. Michael Bogert
Cc: Falvo, Nicholas; Darwin, Veronica; Cook, Steven; Mackey, Cyndy; Woolford, James; Starfield, Lawrence
Subject: RE: Follow Up from Last Week

Michael,

I would like to thank you, Stephen, and Laurel for meeting with us on October 30 and sharing some of Midas Gold's plans for the Stibnite Mine Project in Idaho.

Based on the information you provided, we understand that you are seeking some protection from CERCLA liability in exchange for cleaning up existing contamination in areas you own and/or plan to conduct mining activities.

As you are aware, EPA requires consideration for CERCLA settlement agreements that provide liability protection and conducting a CERCLA response action addressing existing contamination for which others are liable may be appropriate consideration. However, managing newly created waste or cleaning up contamination that you cause would be your responsibility under appropriately issued permits, so any CERCLA liability for those activities would not be addressed prospectively. Of course if you cause new contamination, you may then go through the normal CERCLA process, clean up that contamination in accordance with CERCLA, and receive covenants not to sue and protection from third party contribution claims for that work as provided in our model consent decrees.

In our meeting, it was not clear what cleanup actions you are proposing to carry out or the scope of liability protection you are seeking.

Accordingly, we think it would be helpful for Midas Gold to provide Region 10 with additional technical details about the project (the geographic scope of the planned mining operations and how cleanup actions would be integrated into them; what additional cleanup activities would occur and how legacy contamination at the Site will be addressed; what would be required under reclamation and closure plans; what environmental controls would be required under your water and air permits; the scope of the protection you are seeking; whether future mine expansion could impact other areas of existing contamination, etc.).

This additional information would facilitate EPA's ability to understand the relationship between CERCLA and your planned mining activities and determine whether negotiating a CERCLA agreement would be appropriate.

Sincerely,

Susan Bodine

Susan Parker Bodine
Assistant Administrator
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
202-564-2440

EXHIBIT 6

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert



CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project (SGP)

EPA Region X
December 17, 2018

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

1899
The Thunder Mountain gold rush brings mining to the area

1900-1930
Meadow Creek Mine operations & town of Stibnite is established

1938
Mining at Yellow Pine pit stops salmon migration upstream

1941-1952
The town of Stibnite booms – operations provide 90% of antimony and 40% of tungsten for WWII effort, & later Korean conflict

1952-1960
With WWII & the Korean war over, mining slowed and Stibnite slowly faded

1960s
Earthen dam failure resulting in hundreds of tons of sediment eroding into surrounding streams & rivers, even to this day

1970-1990
Periodic oxide heap leach mines developed by multiple owners and operators

1990s
All mining stopped, PRP's, State & Federal governments conduct limited clean-up & restoration

2009-2015
Midas Gold consolidates land ownership & begins evaluating the geology & environmental conditions within the SGP Project area



CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

1. *How does Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. (MGII) plan to define "existing contamination" and maintain that distinction?*

(The comingling of legacy tailings and new ore from processing and the comingled waste as well as the expansion of open pits with legacy contamination complicates the distinction.)

- Many of the areas are documented on site by legacy private, state, federal and MGII investigations, but some are known, but not well characterized and others may be unidentified;
- Definition in Gilt Edge AOC:

"Existing Contamination" shall mean:

a. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials present or existing on or under the Site as of the Effective Date;
b. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials that migrated from the Site prior to the Effective Date; and
c. any hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants or Waste Materials presently at the Site that migrate onto or under or from the Site after the Effective Date.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

- Materials consisting of or containing previously processed or handled materials will be mapped prior to/during operations and considered legacy materials (and if appropriate based on characterization, handled and treated as hazardous materials) and be managed separately until they are disposed of, or if they are comingled with modern operations materials, and become part of the materials chain for the proposed operations.

- Materials once excavated and handled may be segregated (depending on character) and if suitable whether they can be treated to recover metals, disposed of on site or transported off site depending upon their character as described in the PRO.

- Legacy materials characterized as hazardous requiring special handling may be placed in on-site or offsite repositories.

- Assumptions in the PRO are that hazardous materials that cannot be reprocessed will be transported off site to suitable licensed disposal facilities.

- A simple decision tree approach to project SOPs will be developed to manage this process.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

2. *EPA would like copies of all MGII studies performed and documents related to existing contamination.*

- MGII has completed numerous studies covering existing environmental conditions on the site. These include characterization of:
  - ✓ Surface water, seeps, adit seeps and groundwater from monitoring wells;
  - ✓ Soil/rock materials in former Development Rock Storage Facilities and Tailings Storage Facilities;
  - ✓ Various legacy stockpiles and fill materials;
  - ✓ Area wide stream sediments, soils and rocks; and
  - ✓ Materials characterization studies (SCLP, HCT, etc.).
- Specific studies include:
  - ✓ MSE Phase I and Phase II Reports
  - ✓ Baseline SWQ data report (B-C version) and MGII SWQ dbase (if appropriate);
  - ✓ Monitoring well dbase and characterization data for GW quality (including seeps) throughout project area;
  - ✓ Exploration soil and rock dbase (with caveats of methodology differences between methods and protocols); and
  - ✓ SRK SLCP, HCT and other analyses of existing materials (from SRK, McClelland work);

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

3. Please clarify the locations of existing contamination and how the footprint overlaps with what MGII is disturbing in its operations.

Upper Man Camp Legacy Stockpiles in EFSFSR Floodplain

Legacy disturbance-PRO overlay map



CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

USGS/MGII Water Quality Studies

(2012 – Present)

1. Characterize current conditions
2. Assess from regulatory perspective
3. Identify potential for releases and ID possible source areas
4. Establish baseline for background to guide permitting and ARARs



CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

Arsenic and Antimony Primary COC





SOURCE: USGS (2015)

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project





Brown AND Caldwell

Date: October 2018
Project No. 150691
Client: Midas Gold

Figure 2
Hydrogeologic Cross Section A-A'-A"

Stibnite Gold Project

SOURCE: Modified (October 2018) from Brown and Caldwell (June 30, 2017 SWWQ Study)

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

4. *What is MGII's estimate of the volume of tails, spent ore & other legacy wastes that currently exist at the site?*

- There are an estimated 33 million tons of legacy mining materials spread over 30 sites in the project area;
- Some are well characterized in 3-D based on drill data and extensive sampling;
- Others however, lack quality volumetric data (specifically some former landfills, areas of mixed wastes and areas previously disturbed during site removal actions) Very few as-builts exist or were even created by state and federal OSC's during VCO and AOC activities;
- Many sites were disturbed numerous times by multiple legacy operators and regulatory agencies during reclamation, restoration and enforcement actions; and
- MGII has developed high quality LIDAR derived topographic maps and recovered numerous legacy era maps providing a solid foundation for subsurface studies, determination of spatial distribution of potential waste materials and volumetric estimates.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

Some examples:

Tailing contaminated alluvium in central reach EFSFS

Tailing in EFSFSR floodplain adjacent former check dam/lagoon

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

5. *What volume of these materials does MGI intend to reprocess, reuse in construction, disturb, manage, or handle in any way?*

- General volumetric calculations are provided in the PRO;
- Materials may be excavated and:
  - Moved and hauled offsite to licensed facilities;
  - Moved and stored in properly engineering facilities on site; and
  - Moved and reused, and/or Moved and reprocessed.
- Sites where activity may involve handling of formerly handled materials include:
  - SODA (~8 million short tons);
  - Tailings (~4 million short tons);
  - Meadow Creek Mine area DRSF's and former Hecla heap leach pad materials (~1.4 million short tons) including former smelter and mill wastes;
  - Yellow Pine pit area and Monday Camp DRSF (~5 million short tons);
  - West End in pit bench-fill DRSF (~9 million short tons); and
  - North Tunnel DRSF.



SODA construction mid-1980's (USFS Collection)



1980's spent ore placement on 1930's-50's era tails (USFS Collection)

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

6. Would these volumes change under different EIS alternatives being considered by the US Forest Service?

- Yes, they would if implemented;
- USFS/USACE are pursuing evaluation of an alternative to place the TSF in the EFSFSR basin vs. the proposed Meadow Creek site – an alternative MGII and its engineering and environmental teams see as having no significant environmental advantages, increases technical risk; and
- The result of the USFS proposed alternative would result in no changes nor cleanup of the large unlined TSF from legacy operations, no restoration of Blowout Creek a major source of excess sediment in the EFSFSR drainage and have significant negative overall economic and environmental impacts.

Spent Ore Disposal Area (SODA) in 2015. Note rip rap channel.



Yellow Pine "Glory Hole" Pit and EFSFSR cascade (2012).

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

7. *What is the extent of disturbance at the Site related to previous activities by MGII?*

- MGII has disturbed a total of 18 acres (much of which were existing roads and parking areas, but still counted as disturbance) during exploration operations. This number is cumulative (and there is some double counting of disturbance where drill sites were reoccupied and reutilized more than once);
- Approximately 0.385 acres (mostly road and camp site areas) remain un-reclaimed as they are still in use; and
- Approximately 2X as much reclamation and restoration work has occurred vs. disturbance
  - Reclaimed 33 acres since 2009;
  - 52,640 trees planted since 2011;
  - 30.5 tons of scrap metal removed;
  - Noxious weed removal program; and
  - $190,000 on public road gravelling (7 miles) & culvert replacement.

Tree planting (2013).

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

8. *Does Midas Gold plan to clean up all areas of existing contamination even if Midas doesn't plan to mine in those areas?*

- Not at this time; but the PRO includes Blowout Creek restoration.

If not, please identify and describe those areas where potential sources of contamination may remain in place.

- On and below CSM-PMC-SMI heap leach pads;
- NW Bradley DRSF and stockpiles;
- Various backfill areas along old roads and former Garnet Pit;
- Materials between Box culvert and southern limit of YP pit disturbance;
- Sugar Creek DRSF;
- DMEA DRSF;
- Former upper West End DRSF; and
- Fern and Cinnabar.

(all of the above except West End DRSF outside scope and disturbance footprint of project)

Legacy DMEA DRSF (USFS land)
Note active slump into unnamed drainage

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

9. Please describe MGII's plans for the integration of CERCLA cleanup activities and the mining operations.

- In areas known or suspected to contain hazardous materials (whether from modern or legacy operations) MGII will include appropriate SOPs for such operations and involve use of decision trees as discussed in the response to Q1:
  - Materials not previously characterized will be characterized prior to handling and/or upon discovery in the case of previously unidentified hazardous materials;
  - Procedures will be consistent with applicable mining and environmental compliance regulations and utilize protocols similar to and consistent with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs).



Legacy Bradley Smelter and Mill Complex
(Circa 1950, USFS collection)

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

10. How does MGII envision EPA and the Forest Service working together on an integrated mining and cleanup operation (given their different statutory authority)?

- Areas of known or suspected contamination (characterized further as needed) outside of footprint would be straightforward with all activities authorized under CERCLA authority and managed in coordination with EPA, State and/or USFS OSC;
- Oversight of activities in areas of overlap (legacy cleanup and ops) would also likely be handled with EPA, State and/or USFS OSC coordinating with Payette Minerals staff; and
- Any financial assurance associated with proposed mining operations can and will include provisions and appropriate clauses and management procedures to cover any anticipated CERCLA required financial assurance (and tied to bond) and managed via an MOU between the EPA and USFS as appropriate.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

11. *What the expectations with respect to the CERCLA Section 121 permitting exemptions?*

- MGII would seek standard protections and permit exceptions for handling, transport and disposal of legacy hazardous materials excavated and not reused or reprocessed;
  - This would include 401, 402, 404 and other necessary state and federal permit exemptions specific to the individual removal action sites.
- For sites potentially out of the footprint of proposed operations, where CERCLA protections could be granted and removal actions and subsequent restoration work could occur, MGII would expect appropriate permit exemptions to facilitate timely removal and site stabilization.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

12. What has been done, and if anything will MGII do to mitigate existing releases at the Site? How does MGII plan to prevent future releases or exposure to contamination?

- MGII has conducted and is currently conducting significant site investigations to evaluate potential presence and potential for releases of hazardous substances on and around the project site;
- Extensive water monitoring and site materials characterization testing (+100 holes);
- Extensive site characterization or surface materials (native and contaminated sediments, soils, rocks and various waste materials);
- In addition, MGII has funded (cooperatively with the Idaho Department of Water Resources and the US Geological Survey) synoptic studies, five stream gaging stations, and a number of other environmental studies on the site;

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

- Midas Gold restoration activities:
  - Extensive replanting (~55,000 lodgepole pines from native seed stock) and 300 willows in wetland areas;
  - Established over 200 sediment and stormwater management engineering control BMP's for that has included repairs, upgrades and routine maintenance of 15 miles of county roads since 2009;
  - Removal of over 33 short tons of legacy scrap metal from the project site;
  - Reclamation and restoration of over 33 acres (as of 2016) since 2009;

Open legacy 1940's adit in Clark Tunnel area prior to MGII closure in 2011

Legacy culvert draining into EFSFSR prior to MGII repair 2010

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

13. What activities will be part of reclamation or mitigation in PRO?

- Explained in the PRO Chapter 14:
  - Provision of a tunnel around the current Yellow Pine pit to keep the EFSFSR separate from mining activities and facilitate fish passage during operations, allowing restoration of fish migration and populations early in the Project life;
  - Backfilling the Yellow Pine pit to reestablish a natural riverine flow system for the EFSFSR and to permanently reestablish fish passage to Meadow Creek and the upper reaches of the EFSFSR;
  - Reestablishing and enhancing a durable habitat to provide long-term support for the fishery resource upstream of the present Yellow Pine pit fish blockage, including enhancement of riparian areas and enhancement of spawning beds;
  - Repairing Blowout Creek and wetlands upstream of the historical dam failure to restore functionality, while improving downstream water quality by reducing sediment generation;

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

- Repairing, replacing, establishing, and enhancing wetland/riparian habitat areas throughout the site, including the EFSFSR and Meadow Creek, and on the reclaimed DRSFs and TSF;
- Removing and re-processing legacy tailings, a potential source of metals impacting surface and groundwater, early in the Project life;
- Removing legacy development rock and spent ore material, in order to improve water quality, and reusing these for construction;
- Removing potentially contaminated materials from the site of the old mill and smelter facilities in the Meadow Creek valley, and any other sites encountered during Project construction or operations;
- Closing and decommissioning the new ore processing facilities upon conclusion of operations;
- Removing surface facilities and infrastructure (except where selected facilities will benefit future activities);
- Re-contouring artificial landforms to blend more naturally into the landscape;

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

- Replacing growth medium material; and
- Establishing a productive and sustainable vegetative community on areas disturbed by Project activities, historic activities, and areas disturbed by previous forest fires within the Project area, with resulting mitigation and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

Concurrent Restoration

	ACTIVITY	Construction 1	2	3	Operations 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Closure 16	17	18	19	20
Water Quality	Remove sources of water quality degradation																				
	Remove spent ore and tailings from Meadow Creek valley		2																		
	Legacy materials reprocessing				4																
	Remove legacy development rock at Yellow Pine Pit & West End Pit			3																	
Stream and Wetland Enhancement, Restoration and Mitigation	Stream Restoration (concurrent reclamation)																				
	Install rock drain and weir at Blowout Creek, elevate groundwater table			3																	
	EFSFSR stream habitat and riparian enhancements			3																	
	Lower Meadow Creek diversion around Hangar Flats pit			3																	
	Fiddle Creek restored											11									
	EFSFSR, Hennessy Creek, Midnight Creek restored																				
	Upper Meadow Creek (TSF) restored																				
	Blowout/Lower Meadow Creek routed to HF Lake																	17			
	Decommission fish tunnel																	18			
	Garnet Creek restored																	18			
	Route West End Creek into West End pit																				
	Final restoration of Blowout Creek																				
	Wetland mitigation			3																	
Revegetation	Revegetation																				
	Reforest burned areas	1																			
	Revegetation	1																			

*EFSFSR = East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

14. *What cleanup activities does MGII expect CERCLA protection for beyond the scope of reclamation or mitigation?*

- No proposed mitigation [404 or otherwise] touching contamination absent CERCLA protection; and
- Disturbance of existing contamination within the Project footprint and called for to execute Plan of Operations (e.g., to build fish tunnel) not otherwise reprocessed or reused.

Drums and debris in old lagoon in central reach EFSFSR
Blowout sediment at surface, underlain by tailings

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

15. How does MGII envision fulfillment of the NCP (including RI/FS and remedy selection) necessary prior to implementation of the remedy? How does that integrate with permitting and ongoing mining operations?

- The Gilt Edge AOC contained EPA-approved response actions that were required to be consistent with NCP:
  - "The Work required by this Settlement is necessary to protect the public health, welfare, or the environment and, if carried out in compliance with the terms of this Settlement, will be consistent with the NCP, as provided in Section 300.700(c)(3)(ii) of the NCP."
- Presumably any response activity sanctioned in an AOC would be NCP-compliant and thus complementary to any future remedy.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

16. What is the scope of covenants and contribution protection MGII is seeking in a CERCLA settlement agreement?

- No expectation of CERCLA protection from mining operation itself;
- No exposure to past response costs from USFS, EPA and State of Idaho; and
- Covenants not to sue and protections for clean-up activities cradle to grave for non-comingled waste materials handled, managed and disposed of.

CERCLA and the Stibnite Gold Project

17. If MGII is seeking CERCLA protection for initial disturbance, how would it be defined?

- We are not certain we need protection for "initial disturbance" as we think the question is intended;
- The Gilt Edge AOC provides protection from "Existing Contamination" tied to an "Effective Date," two defined terms in the AOC; and
- Agnico Eagle was required to perform response activity as defined through a Statement of Work and approved Work Plans that involved disturbing "Existing Contamination" that is subject to an exiting remedy on the Gilt Edge NPL Site.

EXHIBIT 7

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert



LEGEND

- A01 - 6785.98' / B01 - 6787.99': Alluvial Groundwater Elevation / Bedrock Groundwater Elevation
- Alluvial Groundwater Level
- Bedrock Groundwater Level
- Sedimentary Pit Fill
- Quaternary Sedimentary Deposits (Undifferentiated)
- Bedrock (Primarily Cretaceous Granitics)
- YP-S-8 2860: Surface Water Location, Spring 2015 Total Arsenic (ug/L)
- MWH-A07/B07 ###: Monitoring Well and Screened Interval, Spring 2015 Total Arsenic (ug/L)
- Exceeds CMC Acute Aquatic Life Standard (340 ug/L)
- Exceeds CCC Chronic Life Standard (150 ug/L)
- Exceeds EPA Primary Drinking Water Standard (10ug/L)

Brown AND Caldwell

Date: October 2018
Project No. 150691
Client: Midas Gold

Figure 1
Hydrogeologic Cross Section A-A'-A"
Water Resources Summary Report
Stibnite Gold Project



LEGEND

- A01 - 6785.98' / B01 - 6787.99' — Alluvial Groundwater Elevation / Bedrock Groundwater Elevation
- Alluvial Groundwater Level
- Bedrock Groundwater Level
- Sedimentary Pit Fill
- Quaternary Sedimentary Deposits (Undifferentiated)
- Bedrock (Primarily Cretaceous Granitics)
- YP-S-8 2860 — Surface Water Location / Spring 2015 Total Arsenic (ug/L)
- MWH-A07/B07 ### — Monitoring Well and Screened Interval / Spring 2015 Total Arsenic (ug/L)
- Exceeds CMC Acute Aquatic Life Standard (340 ug/L)
- Exceeds CCC Chronic Life Standard (150 ug/L)
- Exceeds EPA Primary Drinking Water Standard (10ug/L)

0 1,000 2,000
Feet
Vertical exagerration = 10x

Figure 2
Cross Section from URS, 2000
Stibnite Area Site Characterization Report

Brown AND Caldwell

Date: October 2018
Project No. 150691
Client: Midas Gold

Figure 2
Hydrogeologic Cross Section A-A'-A"

Stibnite Gold Project

EXHIBIT 8

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

405 S. 8th Street #201
Boise, ID USA 83702
info@midasgoldidaho.com

MAX.TSX
MDRPF.OTCQX

www.midasgoldidaho.com

February 28, 2019

Keith B. Lannom
Forest Supervisor
Payette National Forest
500 N Mission Street
McCall, ID 83638

Via: USPS and Email: klannom@fs.fed.us

Re: Submittal of Supplemental Groundwater Data - Stibnite Gold Project

Dear Keith:

I am writing to bring to the attention of the Payette National Forest ("PNF") the results of recent groundwater sampling at the Stibnite Gold Project ("SGP" or "Project"). Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. and its corporate parent, Midas Gold Corporation (collectively, "Midas Gold") are, jointly, a bona fide prospective purchaser ("BFPP") under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 ("CERCLA") with respect to their patented private lands on the Project Site acquired pursuant the 1872 Mining Law.[1] BFPP status is an exclusion from liability under CERCLA.

I am confirming and updating prior information we previously transmitted consistently reporting elevated levels of arsenic and antimony in groundwater at the Project Site. This information was gathered as part of the ongoing baseline characterization of the Site and in support of permitting and National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") review of the Company's Plan of Restoration and Operations ("PRO") by the Payette National Forest. On June 30, 2017, as a part of the Stibnite Gold Project permitting process and NEPA review, Midas Gold provided the PNF information from water quality monitoring from 2012 through Q2 2016 indicating elevated arsenic and antimony levels in groundwater beneath the Project Site. A copy of that electronic correspondence is enclosed as Attachment A. Pursuant to NEPA information sharing protocols, the PNF was obligated to provide a copy of this information to EPA Region 10 and the

1. Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC and Stibnite Gold Company (a wholly owned subsidiary of Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC), control patented and unpatented millsite and lode claims at the SGP. Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Midas Gold Corporation. Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. provides management services to Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC and Stibnite Gold Company and will operate the Project on their behalf.

Exhibit D

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality as well as the other cooperating agencies, which obligation we assume they completed.

Consistent with our ongoing assessment of the current Site conditions, we have just completed the latest Water Quality Summary Report supplementing previously-provided data which is now inclusive of data collected in calendar year 2017. That report is enclosed as Attachment B. We will also be transmitting this report through the customary NEPA information sharing protocols with the understanding it will be distributed to the cooperating agencies. A Water Quality Summary Report for calendar year 2018 is nearing completion and will be provided to the PNF soon.

The most current Water Quality Summary Report includes measurements of elevated arsenic and antimony in ground and surface water sampling locations across the Site. One alluvial monitoring well (MWH-A19) has measured particularly high arsenic concentrations; typically ranging from 3,000 to 6,000 µg/L and as high as 7,520 µg/L from a sample gathered in Q2 2017. By comparison, the arsenic concentration measured in the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River ("EFSFSR") near this location (site YP-SR-04) during the same quarterly monitoring period was measured at 48.4 µg/L.

It is unclear why these elevated arsenic levels were measured at MWH-A19, but its location is downgradient of a legacy Forest Service constructed repository for hazardous material that is adjacent to the EFSFSR. Other potential sources of the elevated arsenic and antimony in ground and surface water at the Site may also include naturally occurring, *in situ* mineralized rock, as well as development rock, spent ore, and milled tailings from historical mining operations.

Additionally, we have consistently measured elevated levels of arsenic and antimony in the Meadow Creek valley area in locations downgradient from the Spent Ore Disposal Area ("SODA") where tailings from milling operations were deposited on Forest Service land during World War II and the Korean War, some of which area was subsequently patented. Alluvial groundwater sampled in wells MWH-A04 and MWH-A05 regularly show arsenic concentrations of 1,000 – 3,000 µg/L; groundwater in well MWH-A07 regularly shows antimony concentrations of 600-1,600 µg/L.

Recall that in the PRO, we propose to remove approximately 3 million tons of legacy tailings presently located under SODA from their unconstrained and unlined historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek valley to be reprocessed and disposed of within a state-of-the-art, composite-lined tailings storage facility ("TSF"). Additionally, approximately 7.5 million tons of legacy spent ore, in the SODA and in historical leach pads, would be removed from their historical deposition areas in the Meadow Creek valley to be reused in the construction of the TSF. These activities are intended to reduce sources of arsenic and antimony and improve ground and surface water quality.

Under our continuing CERCLA legal obligations and, more importantly, our dedication to the proper stewardship of the Site and surrounding area, we have been and will continue to provide full cooperation, assistance, and access to persons who are authorized to conduct response actions or natural resource restoration on the Stibnite Site. We remain committed to providing the Forest Service whatever additional information or assistance that you might find helpful in evaluating the information we are providing.

In its NEPA review, the PNF has largely ignored the Company's remediation and restoration commitments in the Plan of Restoration and Operation. On a number of occasions, the PNF has questioned that the Company's restoration plan was perhaps a public relations gimmick. Midas Gold did not cause and is not liable for the elevated contaminant levels we continue to discover and report from the Stibnite Site. However, in the PRO and subsequent information provided in support of the NEPA review, Midas Gold has provided a comprehensive plan to address legacy issues on Site.

Midas Gold remains committed to integrating restoration into our future Site operations and, should the PRO be approved, our restoration plan would squarely address legacy contamination, such as that indicated by this recent data, and eliminate its sources. We are resolute that the Stibnite Gold Project is a model of private investment to resolve Site environmental legacies that would otherwise be left to taxpayers.

Sincerely,
MIDAS GOLD IDAHO, INC.

Laurel Sayer
President and CEO

Enclosures: (2)

Attachment A
Attachment B

cc: Dave Rosenkrance
Gordon Cruickshank

From: Brandy Lapthorne
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 5:01 PM
To: Piper Goessel <kgoessel@fs.fed.us>; Valerie Porter <valerie.porter@aecom.com>
Cc: Glindeman, Todd (TGlindeman@brwncald.com) <TGlindeman@brwncald.com>; 'Alan Haslam' <ahaslam@agrium.com>; Shelley Bennett <sbennett@midasgoldinc.com>; Bob Barnes (bbarnes@midasgoldcorp.com) <bbarnes@midasgoldcorp.com>; Shepherd, Maria <maria.shepherd@aecom.com>; Rowles, Lisa (lrowles@BrwnCald.com) <lrowles@BrwnCald.com>; Steinpress, Martin (msteinpress@BrwnCald.com) <msteinpress@BrwnCald.com>
Subject: Midas - WRSR and SW/GW Baseline Reports

Piper/Valerie

The following documents have been uploaded to the Project SharePoint Site at the following location:

1. Water Resources Summary Report (WRSR) [https://midasgoldsp.aecomonline.net/Shared Documents/Midas Gold Transfer/Baseline/WR Summary Report]
    a. This WRSR summarizes the information contained in the following four baseline study reports. This document was created to assist the Forest Service/AECOM in understanding surface water and groundwater resources at the site and surface water/ groundwater interaction. It combines the water resources baseline studies with geologic information and an overview of the historical mine features into a comprehensive document that summarizes and analyzes the data. The WRSR document should be considered the primary review document for Forest Service/AECOM staff. We hope that by developing the WRSR that it makes the assimilation of the information more efficient. The foundational baseline study plans and reports are included here for reference.
    b. Report and Appendices

2. Groundwater Hydrology [https://midasgoldsp.aecomonline.net/Shared Documents/Midas Gold Transfer/Baseline/GW Hydrology]
    a. Work Plan
    b. Report

3. Groundwater Quality [https://midasgoldsp.aecomonline.net/Shared Documents/Midas Gold Transfer/Baseline/GW Quality]
    a. Work Plans – multiple revisions through the years
    b. QAPPs – multiple revisions through the years
    c. Report and Appendices

4. Surface Water Hydrology [https://midasgoldsp.aecomonline.net/Shared Documents/Midas Gold Transfer/Baseline/SW Hydrology]
    a. Work Plan
    b. Report
    c. Field Survey

5. Surface water Quality [https://midasgoldsp.aecomonline.net/Shared Documents/Midas Gold Transfer/Baseline/SW Quality]

a. Work Plan
b. QAPPs – multiple revisions through the years
c. Report and Appendices

Please note, Midas/BC had intended on supplying the Groundwater Model Work Plan, however, the document is still in internal review and will not be available for upload until next week. I will send a separate e-mail and link when the document is uploaded.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I hope you all have a nice holiday weekend. Thank you

Brandy Lapthorne for:

Todd Glindeman
Associate Scientist
Brown and Caldwell | Boise, ID
TGlindeman@brwncald.com
T 208.389.7707 | **C** 208.870.7990

Brown AND Caldwell

950 Bannock Street, Suite 350
Boise, Idaho 83702

T: 208.389.7700
F: 208.389.7750

Transmittal Cover Sheet

To: Piper Goessel, CMA1, MEC Stibnite Mine Project Manager 500 N Mission St, Bldg 1 McCall, ID 83638	**Date:** June 30, 2017	**Transmittal No.:** GWH-1
	Project No.: 150695	**Task No.:** 006
	Project Title: Midas Gold Stibnite Mine EIS Project	
From: Todd Glindeman, Project Manager		
We are sending the following item(s): ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Plan ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Report	**Sent via:** ☒ SharePoint Site Upload	
These are transmitted as checked below: ☒ For Review and Approval		

If attachments are not as noted, please notify sender at once.

No. of Copies	Description
1	20170504_MGII_Final GW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_WorkPlan.pdf
1	20170504_MGII_Final GW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_Report.pdf

Remarks:

cc: Valerie Porter, AECOM Maria Shepherd, AECOM Bob Barnes, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Alan Haslam, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Shelley Bennett, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.	**Prepared by:** Brandy Lapthorne **Title:** Assistant PM

Brown AND Caldwell

950 Bannock Street, Suite 350
Boise, Idaho 83702

T: 208.389.7700
F: 208.389.7750

Transmittal Cover Sheet

To: Piper Goessel, CMA1, MEC Stibnite Mine Project Manager 500 N Mission St, Bldg 1 McCall, ID 83638	**Date:** June 30, 2017	**Transmittal No.:** SWH-1
	Project No.: 150695	**Task No.:** 006
	Project Title: Midas Gold Stibnite Mine EIS Project	
From: Todd Glindeman, Project Manager		
We are sending the following item(s): ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Plan ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Reports	**Sent via:** ☒ SharePoint Site Upload	
These are transmitted as checked below: ☒ For Review and Approval		

If attachments are not as noted, please notify sender at once.

No. of Copies	Description
1	20170630_MGII_Final SW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_WorkPlan.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_Report.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2012 SW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_FieldSurvey.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2012 SWH Field Survey Appendix K
1	20170630_MGII_2012 SW Hydrology_BaselineStudy_FieldSurvey Figure 1-3.pdf

Remarks:

cc: Valerie Porter, AECOM Maria Shepherd, AECOM Bob Barnes, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Alan Haslam, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Shelley Bennett, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.	**Prepared by:** Brandy Lapthorne **Title:** Assistant PM

Brown AND Caldwell

950 Bannock Street, Suite 350
Boise, Idaho 83702

T: 208.389.7700
F: 208.389.7750

Transmittal Cover Sheet

To: Piper Goessel, CMA1, MEC Stibnite Mine Project Manager 500 N Mission St, Bldg 1 McCall, ID 83638	**Date:** June 30, 2017	**Transmittal No.:** SWQ-1
	Project No.: 150695	**Task No.:** 006
	Project Title: Midas Gold Stibnite Mine EIS Project	
From: Todd Glindeman, Project Manager		
We are sending the following item(s): ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Plan and QAPPs ☒ NEPA Baseline Study Reports	**Sent via:** ☒ SharePoint Site Upload	
These are transmitted as checked below: ☒ For Review and Approval		

If attachments are not as noted, please notify sender at once.

No. of Copies	Description
1	20170630_MGII_Final SW Quality_BaselineStudy_WorkPlan.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2012 SW Quality_QAPP.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2013 SW Quality_QAPP.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2014 SW Quality_QAPP.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2015 SW Quality_QAPP.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_2016 SW Quality_QAPP.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SW Quality_BaselineStudy_Report.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix A.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix B.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix C.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix D.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix E.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix F.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix G.pdf
1	20170630_MGII_Final SWQ_BaselineStudy_Rept_Appendix H.xlsx

Remarks:	
cc: Valerie Porter, AECOM Maria Shepherd, AECOM Bob Barnes, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Alan Haslam, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. Shelley Bennett, Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.	**Prepared by:** Brandy Lapthorne **Title:** Assistant PM

EXHIBIT 9

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

405 S. 8th Street #201
Boise, ID USA 83702
info@midasgoldidaho.com

MAX.TSX
MDRPF.OTCQX

www.midasgoldidaho.com

August 13, 2019

Tawnya Brummett
Acting Forest Supervisor
Payette National Forest
500 North Mission Street
McCall, Idaho 83638

Via: USPS and Email tbrummett@fs.fed.us

Re: Submittal of Supplemental Surface and Ground Water Data - Stibnite Gold Project

Dear Ms. Brummett:

On behalf of my corporate CEO Stephen Quin and myself, it was a pleasure to visit this past week and discuss several matters related to the Stibnite Gold Project ("SGP"). We look forward to working with you and your team in the days ahead.

On behalf of Midas Gold Idaho, Inc., I am writing to follow up on my previous correspondence to Keith Lannom of February 28, 2019, bringing to the attention of the Payette National Forest ("PNF") the results of additional groundwater sampling at the SGP Site.

Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. and its corporate parent, Midas Gold Corporation (collectively, "Midas Gold" or the "Company") have bona fide prospective purchaser ("BFPP") status under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9675 ("CERCLA") with respect to their patented private lands on the Project Site acquired pursuant to the 1872 Mining Law.[1] BFPP status is an exclusion from liability under CERCLA, and Midas Gold is providing this information consistent with CERCLA § 101(40) to maintain that status.

In February, Midas Gold provided the PNF sampling results showing elevated levels of arsenic and antimony in groundwater at the SGP Site. Midas Gold began formal groundwater sampling in 2010, in connection with baseline characterization of the Site and in support of the NEPA review of the Plan of Restoration and Operations ("PRO") for the Stibnite Gold Mine. In compliance with CERCLA § 101(40), Midas Gold continues to fulfill its continuing obligations, including exercising appropriate care and providing notice with respect to discovered hazardous substances and providing full cooperation, assistance and access to persons authorized to conduct response actions or natural resource restoration

1. Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC and Stibnite Gold Company (a wholly owned subsidiary of Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC), control patented and unpatented millsite and lode claims at the SGP. Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Midas Gold Corporation. Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. provides management services to Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC and Stibnite Gold Company and will operate the Project on their behalf.

at a facility. 42 U.S.C. §§ 101(40)(C)-(E). Midas Gold has been, and is presently, complying with these continuing obligations under CERCLA to maintain its BFPP status and attendant liability protection and fully comply with the law.

Consistent with Midas Gold's ongoing assessment of the current Site conditions, the Company has recently completed the latest Water Quality Summary Report ("WQSR") supplementing previously provided data, which now includes data collected through 2018. That report is enclosed as Attachment A. We will also be transmitting this report through the customary NEPA information sharing protocols with the understanding it will be distributed to the cooperating agencies.

The most current WQSR continues to measure elevated arsenic and antimony in ground and surface water sampling locations across the Site.[2] As we reported in February, those elevated levels were generally measured downgradient of historical mining areas. For example, elevated arsenic levels were detected downgradient of a legacy Forest Service-constructed repository for hazardous material that is adjacent to the East Fork South Fork of the Salmon River. As we also advised the PNF in February (in addition to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality), Midas Gold continues to measure elevated levels of arsenic and antimony in the Meadow Creek valley area in locations downgradient from the Spent Ore Disposal Area where tailings from milling operations were deposited on Forest Service land during World War II and the Korean War. Other potential sources of the elevated arsenic and antimony in ground and surface water at the Site may include naturally occurring, *in situ* mineralized rock, as well as development rock, spent ore, and milled tailings from historical mining operations.

Under Midas Gold's continuing CERCLA legal obligations and, more importantly, its dedication to the proper stewardship of the Site and surrounding area, Midas Gold has provided and will continue to provide full cooperation, assistance, and access to persons who are authorized to conduct response actions or natural resource restoration on the Stibnite Gold Project Site pursuant to CERCLA § 101(40)(E). Midas Gold remains committed to providing the PNF whatever additional information or assistance that the agency might find helpful in evaluating the information the Company is providing.

Please call me if you have any questions about this letter.

Sincerely,
MIDAS GOLD IDAHO, INC.

Laurel Sayer
President and CEO

cc: Dave Rosenkrance
Gordon Cruickshank

Electronic Attachments (2)

2. We are also separately providing data for one alluvial monitoring well (MWH-A19), which is consistently reporting particularly high arsenic concentrations. That report is enclosed as Attachment B.

EXHIBIT 10

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

IN THE MATTER OF	)	VOLUNTARY CONSENT
	)	ORDER/ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER ON
Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.	)	CONSENT
Stibnite Mining District	)	

I. PARTIES

The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality ("IDEQ") and the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") enter into this Voluntary Consent Order/Administrative Order on Consent ("Agreement") with Midas Gold Corp. ("MGC") as the owner of Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. ("MGII"), and Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC ("IGRCLLC") as the owner of Stibnite Gold Company ("SGC"), with MGII being the mine operator and IGRCLLC and SGC being the owners of various patented, unpatented and mill site claims that comprise the property, (collectively "Midas"). All parties enter into this Agreement voluntarily. IDEQ and EPA are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Agencies." IDEQ, EPA, and Midas are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Parties" and may be singularly referred to as a "Party."

II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF AGREEMENT

The purpose and scope of this Agreement is to carry out a limited investigation into Existing Contamination from historical mining operations in the Stibnite Mining District ("the Stibnite Site") in the state of Idaho. The investigation activities for which Midas seeks approval are more particularly set forth in the Statement of Work ("SOW") attached hereto as Appendix A, incorporated herein by reference.

III. DEFINITIONS

Unless otherwise expressly provided herein, terms used in this Agreement that are defined in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act ("Clean Water Act" or "CWA"), or the Idaho Environmental Protection and Health Act ("EPHA") shall have the meaning assigned to them in those statutes or their implementing regulations, including any amendments thereto. Whenever terms listed below are used in this Agreement, the following definitions shall apply:

a. "Agency" or "Agencies" shall mean IDEQ and EPA.

b. "Agreement" shall mean this Voluntary Consent Order/Administrative Order on Consent, all appendices attached hereto (listed in Section XI), and all documents incorporated by reference into this Agreement. In the event of conflict between this Agreement and any appendix, this Agreement shall control.

c. "BFPP" shall mean a bona fide prospective purchaser as defined in section 101(40) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(40).

d. "CERCLA" shall mean the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601–9675.

e. "Covered Sites" shall mean the Forest Service Repository and the DMEA Dump.

f. "CWA" shall mean the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251–1387.

g. "Day" shall mean a calendar day unless expressly stated to be a working day. "Working day" shall mean a day other than a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday. In computing any period of time under this Agreement, where the last day would fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday, the period shall run until the close of business of the next working day.

h. "DMEA Dump" shall mean the dump area associated with tunnel construction by the Bradley Mining Company, depicted on Appendix C.

i. "Effective Date" shall be the effective date of this Agreement as provided in Section X.

j. "EFSFSR" shall mean the East Fork South Fork Salmon River.

k. "EPA" shall mean the United States Environmental Protection Agency and any successor departments or agencies of the United States.

l. "EPHA" shall mean the Idaho Environmental Protection and Health Act, Idaho Code §§ 39-101 to 39-130.

m. "Existing Contamination" shall mean:

   i. any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants present or existing on or under the Stibnite Site as of the Effective Date;

   ii. any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants that migrated from the Stibnite Site before the Effective Date; and

   iii. any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants presently at the Stibnite Site that migrate onto or under or from the Stibnite Site after the Effective Date.

n. "Forest Service" or "USFS" shall mean the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service and any successor departments or agencies of the United States.

o. "Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository" means the legacy Forest Service-constructed repository depicted on Appendix C.

p. "HWMA" shall mean the Hazardous Waste Management Act of 1983, Idaho Code §§ 39-4401 to 39-4432.

q. "IDEQ" shall mean the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and any successor departments or agencies of the State of Idaho.

r. "IGRCLLC" shall mean Idaho Gold Resources Company, LLC.

s. "MGII" shall mean Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.

t. "MGC" shall mean Midas Gold Corp.

u. "Midas" shall mean MGII, MGC, IGRCLLC, and SGC.

v. "Mining Claims" shall mean those certain patented mining claims owned by Midas.

w. "National Contingency Plan" or "NCP" shall mean the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan promulgated pursuant to section 105 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9605, codified at 40 C.F.R. Part 300, and any amendments thereto.

x. "NEPA" shall mean the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq., as amended, and any regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

y. "Paragraph" shall mean a portion of this Agreement identified by an Arabic numeral or a lower case letter.

z. "Party" or "Parties" shall mean IDEQ, EPA, MGII, and MGC.

aa. "PRO" shall mean Midas's Plan of Restoration and Operations submitted to the Forest Service pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 228 Subpart A.

bb. "Section" shall mean a portion of this Agreement identified by a Roman numeral.

cc. "SGC" shall mean Stibnite Gold Company.

dd. "SOW" shall mean the Statement of Work in Appendix A to this Agreement and any modifications made in accordance with this Agreement.

ee. "Stibnite Gold Project" shall mean Midas's comprehensive restoration, operation, and reclamation plan for the Stibnite Site, detailed in the PRO.

ff. "Stibnite Site" shall mean the historic Stibnite Mining District.

gg. "United States" shall mean the United States of America, its departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

hh. "Work" shall mean the limited investigation of Existing Contamination at the Covered Sites as set forth in the SOW.

ii. "Work Plan" shall mean the plan to be approved by the Agencies pursuant to Section VII of this Agreement.

IV. LIMITATION OF SCOPE

Nothing herein shall be deemed to affect or govern any of the parties' rights, duties, or obligations with respect to the identification, remediation, or cleanup of the Stibnite Site other than at the "Covered Sites." Each Party reserves all claims, rights, causes of action, and defenses with respect to the Stibnite Site, except as provided in this Agreement. The Parties agree that Midas's entry into this Agreement and the actions taken by Midas in accordance with this Agreement do not constitute an admission of any liability by Midas.

V. AUTHORITIES

The Statements of Authority set forth below shall not be construed to restrict, enlarge, or otherwise determine the rights, interests, and jurisdiction of the United States or the State of Idaho, or any of their respective departments, agencies, or members. Nor shall any statements made herein be construed to represent an admission, determination, settlement, or adjudication of any legal or factual dispute relating to any Party's rights, privileges, interests, authority, or jurisdiction. Each Party hereto reserves all claims, rights, causes of action, and defenses with respect to any claim of jurisdiction expressed herein.

1. FEDERAL AUTHORITY. Pursuant to Executive Order 12580, as amended by Executive Order 13016, the authority to conduct various activities and recover costs under CERCLA has been delegated to, among others, EPA. Such response activities include investigations and response activities (42 U.S.C. § 9604), cost recovery (42 U.S.C. § 9607), issuing such orders as may be necessary to protect public health or welfare or the environment (42 U.S.C. § 9606(a)), and entering into agreements to perform investigations (42 U.S.C. § 9622(d)(3)).

2. STATE AUTHORITY. The authority to identify, investigate and clean-up facilities where hazardous substances have come to be located in the State of Idaho has been delegated to IDEQ, pursuant to the EPHA and the Hazardous Waste Management Act of 1983 ("HWMA"), Idaho Code §§ 39-4401 to 39-4432. IDEQ is also the Idaho state agency with the authority to cooperate with EPA and to participate in the initiation and development of CERCLA response actions to be undertaken in the State of Idaho.

VI. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. Midas owns patented mining claims ("Mining Claims") within the Stibnite Site. Extensive mining has been conducted by prior owners and operators of the Stibnite Site, including the Bradley Mining Company. During World War II and the Korean War, mining in the Stibnite Mining District was encouraged and supported by the United

States for strategic mineral development. Those mining activities include underground and open pit mining, heap leaching, ore processing in a mill, smelting, tailings disposal, development rock disposal, waterway diversions, hydro dam development, town and camp sites, haul roads, power lines, landfills, etc. Those activities, compounded by extensive forest fires, have resulted in releases of hazardous substances which have impaired water quality, compromised fish habitat, and elevated metals loading in surface and ground waters. The approximate extent of currently known historical mining operations at the Stibnite Site is indicated on the map attached hereto for informational purposes as Appendix B.

2. The Stibnite Site has been subject to substantial cost recovery litigation under CERCLA, and several consent decrees emerged from these actions including *Mobil Oil Corp. v. United States*, Case No. 1:99-cv-01467-LMB (E.D. Va.) (consent decree filed June 26, 2000); *United States v. Oberbillig*, Case No. 1:02-cv-00451-LMB (D. Idaho) (consent decree filed March 18, 2004); and *United States v. Bradley Mining Company*, Case No. 3:08-CV-03968 TEH (N.D. Cal.) and *United States v. Bradley Mining Company*, Case No. 3:08-CV-05501 TEH (N.D. Cal.) (consent decree filed April 19, 2012).

3. Midas is a bona fide prospective purchaser ("BFPP") as defined by section 101(40) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9601(40). Midas has not conducted mining activities at the Stibnite Site and has conducted environmental investigations and site exploration activities in a manner consistent with and in order to maintain its status as a BFPP. Midas is presently assessing whether the Stibnite Site can be redeveloped, reclaimed, and restored. Midas has proposed to address the historical contamination and environmental impacts at the Stibnite Site through a comprehensive operation, reclamation and restoration plan (the "Stibnite Gold Project"), detailed in a Plan of Restoration and Operations ("PRO") submitted to the Forest Service pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 228 Subpart A.

4. Since 2012, Midas has collected water quality monitoring samples in support of ongoing assessment of current site conditions and the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") review of the PRO. Midas has previously provided those data to IDEQ and EPA, consistent with its continuing obligations as a BFPP.

5. The water quality sampling conducted to date has shown elevated arsenic and antimony levels in ground water beneath the Stibnite Site. One alluvial monitoring well (MWH-A19) near a legacy Forest Service-constructed repository ("Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository") has consistently measured particularly high arsenic concentrations, typically ranging from 3,000 to 6,000 µg/L and as high as 7,520 µg/L in a sample gathered in Q2 2017. By comparison, the arsenic concentration measured in the East Fork South Fork Salmon River ("EFSFR") near this location (site YP-SR-04) during the same quarterly monitoring period was measured at 48.4 µg/L.

6. Elevated arsenic, antimony, and mercury levels have also been detected in sampling locations located near a dump area associated with tunnel construction by the Bradley Mining Company pursuant to a contract and loan by the United States and supervised by

the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration ("DMEA," hereinafter referred to as the "DMEA Dump").

7. The approximate locations of the Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository and the DMEA Dump are indicated on the map attached hereto for informational purposes as Appendix C.

VII. AGREEMENT

1. Without admitting any liability and expressly reserving all claims and defenses except as specifically waived herein, the Parties hereto mutually agree as follows:

    a. Midas agrees to conduct a limited initial investigation (the "Work") into Existing Contamination at the Covered Sites, pursuant to a work plan ("Work Plan") to be submitted for approval to the Agencies pursuant to this Agreement. The Work for which Midas seeks approval is more particularly set forth in the SOW attached hereto as Appendix A.

    b. Within thirty (30) days of the execution date of this Agreement, Midas shall submit the Work Plan to the Agencies for approval. The Work Plan shall describe the proposed investigation activities in detail and propose an expedited schedule to implement them.

    c. Within thirty (30) days following submission of the Work Plan, the Agencies shall approve, disapprove, or request revisions to the Work Plan. If either Agency requests revisions, Midas shall submit a revised Work Plan to both Agencies responding to their request(s) within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the Agency's notification of the requested revisions.

    d. When the Agencies have both approved the Work Plan, Midas shall implement the actions required thereunder as approved in writing by the Agencies in accordance with the schedule they have approved. Once approved, the Work Plan and schedule, and any subsequent modifications to those documents, shall be incorporated into and become fully enforceable under this Agreement.

    e. Midas shall not commence the Work, except as approved by the Agencies and in conformance with the terms of this Agreement. Midas may continue its ongoing water quality monitoring, which is not Work requiring approval under this Agreement.

    f. Midas agrees only to the Work approved pursuant to this Agreement and does not agree to perform any other removal or remedial action at the Stibnite Site. The Parties may, but are not obligated to, address any related removal or remedial action through a subsequent agreement.

VIII. CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL CONTINGENCY PLAN

Any Work implemented or required under this Agreement shall be conducted in a manner that is not inconsistent with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan ("NCP"), 40 C.F.R. Part 300, including without limitation 40 C.F.R. Subpart H (40 C.F.R. §§ 300.415 and 300.700).

IX. COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER LAWS

Except as set forth herein, this Agreement shall not relieve Midas from its obligations to comply with any of the applicable provisions of and the Parties hereto specifically reserve all other rights under the EPHA; the HWMA; the Idaho Water Quality Standards and Wastewater Treatment Requirements, IDAPA 16.01.02.001 to 16.01.02.999; the Rules and Standards for Hazardous Waste, IDAPA 16.01.05.001 to 16.01.05.999; the Ground Water Quality Rule, IDAPA 16.01.11.001-16.01.11.999, CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601–9675 and any other applicable local, state, tribal or federal law.

X. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Conflict Between Agreement and Appendices. To the extent of any conflict between the meaning of the terms and provisions in this Agreement and the Appendices, the meaning in this Agreement shall control.

2. Modifications. This Agreement may be modified by the Parties' mutual agreement. Agreed modifications to the Agreement must be in writing signed by an authorized representative of each Party.

3. Notice. All communications required by this Agreement shall be addressed to:

   [IDEQ Contact]

   [EPA Contact]

   [Midas Contact]
   Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.
   P.O. Box 429
   13181 Hwy 55
   Donnelly, ID 83615

4. Integration. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties. This Agreement Order may not be enlarged, modified, or altered, except in writing signed by the Parties.

5. Authority. Each Party represents and warrants that it has the authority to enter into this Agreement and to take all actions provided for herein and that no further action or authorization is required.

6. Severability. In case any provision or authority of this Agreement or the application of this Agreement to any Party or circumstances is held by any judicial or administrative authority to be invalid, the application of such provisions to other Parties or circumstances and the remainder of the Agreement shall remain in force and not be affected thereby.

7. Termination. Upon fulfilling the requirements of this Agreement, Midas may petition the Agencies in writing for termination of this Agreement. This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect until the Agencies acknowledge in writing that the Agreement is terminated and that Midas has fulfilled all requirements of this Agreement.

8. Successors and Assigns. This Agreement shall bind Midas, its successors and assigns until terminated in writing by the Agencies.

9. Effective Date. The effective date of this Agreement shall be the later of the date of signature by the Director of the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality or the [EPA Representative].

XI. APPENDICES

The following appendices are attached to and incorporated into this Agreement:

a. Appendix A shall mean the SOW.

b. Appendix B shall mean the map depicting the approximate extent of currently known historical mining operations at the Stibnite Site.

c. Appendix C shall mean the map depicting the approximate locations of the Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository and the DMEA Dump.

DATED this __ day of _____, 2019.

By: _____
John Tippets, Director
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

DATED this __ day of _____, 2019.

By: _____
[EPA Representative]
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Environmental Cleanup, Region 10

DATED this __ day of_____, 2019.

By: _____
[xx]
[xx]
Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.

By: _____
[xx]
[xx]
Midas Gold Corp.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF WORK

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS FOR THE STIBNITE MINE SITE

I. PURPOSE

The purpose and objective of the work described by this Statement of Work is to undertake Stibnite Site response activity in areas of previous contamination. Further details of work activities, including the sequencing of actions, will be included in work plans that will subsequently be approved by the Agencies pursuant to the Voluntary Consent Order/Administrative Order on Consent.

II. STATEMENT OF WORK

A. Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository

The subject area is located just south of the EFSFSR below its junction with Sugar Creek and on the west side of the EFSFSR above its junction with Sugar Creek. The Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository is located on private land with a small area in the SW corner on public land.

In 2002 and 2003, the United States Forest Service, in coordination with EPA and IDEQ, constructed an unlined smelter waste repository to store residual soils contaminated with high levels of arsenic and antimony from the former smelter and tailings from various "poison ponds" recovered in two removal actions near the former mill and smelter site (USFS, 2003).

The estimated volume of contaminated material in the Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository is estimated, from an after-action report (MSE, 2003), to be at least 400 cubic yards of smelter soil and residues as well as an unknown amount of former tailings and pond material. The dimensions described for the repository in the Smelter Stack Removal Action Report indicate the constructed cell had dimensions of approximately 288 feet x 77 feet x 8 feet for a total estimated contained volume of approximately 177,408 cubic feet. The estimated volume of tailings, contaminated soils and other materials is estimated at between approximately 6,170 cubic yards and 10,000 cubic yards.

Three groundwater monitoring wells drilled flanking the Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository have weakly elevated arsenic in groundwater, but a single well (MWH-A19) drilled directly down gradient has consistently reported exceptionally high total and dissolved arsenic and antimony (>3000-8000 µg/l arsenic) suggesting the presence of a source of soluble arsenic to load groundwater nearby.

Proposed Elements of the Work Plan

An investigation utilizing dye tests, synoptic methods and other field sampling methods and geochemical characterization is proposed for the spring and summer of 2019 to further evaluate whether a release of hazardous substances to surface waters (EFSRSR) is occurring or likely to occur. Field sampling procedures and measured parameters, sample preservation, chain of custody, analytical and quality control and quality assurance methods and analytical suites and

laboratories will be the same as or consistent with those used in the agency-approved baseline surface and groundwater water quality studies for the MGII PRO (HDR, 2012; MWH, 2012). In particular, the elements of the Work Plan will include:

1. Dye tests & mini-synoptic at high flow vs. low flow;
2. Pump tests; and
3. Additional groundwater quality monitoring and well drilling if required.

B. DMEA Dump

The subject area is located west of and uphill from the EFSFSR below its junction with Meadow Creek. Access is along the Stibnite Road—an improved two-lane public county road just below the dump and via a small unimproved single lane trail up the slope. The dump and portal are on public land managed by the USFS.

The federal government, through United States Bureau of Mines (USBM), sponsored and loaned funds to assist mine operators in locating minable reserves of strategic metals under the Defense Mineral Exploration Administration (DMEA) program. The DMEA Dump area resulting from the tunnel construction has indicated high levels of arsenic, antimony and mercury that could be impacting groundwater and surface water through seepage from the collapsed portal and from the stream passing through the toe of the DMEA Dump.

In particular, surface runoff from the unnamed Creek flows through the dumps and possibly comes in contact with the dump materials and/or adit seepage water loading with metals and passing into groundwater and/or migrating into the EFSFSR several hundred feet nearby and down gradient. Additionally, there is potential surface water impacts to EFSFSR and possibly groundwater from high arsenic, antimony and mercury, which in sampled seep and gully waters has exceeded acute freshwater aquatic life standards down gradient from the dump area.

Proposed Elements of the Work Plan

An investigation utilizing dye tests, synoptic methods and other field sampling methods and geochemical characterization is proposed for the spring and summer of 2019 to further evaluate whether a release of hazardous substances to surface waters (EFSRSR). An auger hole may be warranted to evaluate whether the lower part of the dump is saturated and to help characterize the dumps overall geochemical composition. In particular, the elements of the Work Plan will include:

1. Dye tests & mini-synoptic at high flow vs. low flow;
2. Potential auger drilling to obtain sufficient material for further characterization of the DMEA Dump; and
3. Further Investigation to determine whether seeping bedrock portal can be closed efficiently.

APPENDIX B


Legacy Fill Material
Waste Repository
DRSF/Dump
Fill Material
Landfill
Processing Facility
Sediment Deposit
Spent Ore
Stream Realignment
Tailings
Tailings & Fluvial Material
Workings Underground
Legacy Features
VOC Release
VOC Land Farm
MGI Water Quality Sampling
Monitoring Well
Surface Water Station
[redacted]
[redacted]
N
0
0.25
0.5
1 Miles

APPENDIX C

A. Forest Service Smelter Waste Repository and Profile Locations



Northwest Bradley Waste Rock Dump
& Smelter Waste Repository Cross Section



- Highly elevated geochemical values present in legacy dump materials adjacent to well
- Adjacent wells do not typically exceed WQ standards suggesting a local phenomena
- Bedrock source (at least proximal source) unlikely
- Also potential for other sources upgradient (Yellow Pine Deposit)

B. DMEA Dump Portal and Profile Locations





References

HDR, Inc. (2012) Appendix A, Surface Water Quality Baseline Study Work Plan for the Stibnite Gold Project, 2016. Prepared for Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. and Cooperating Agencies for baseline studies to support the Stibnite Gold Project Environmental Impact Statement, (including updates in 2014, 2015, and 2016)

USFS (2003) Removal Report, Smelter Stack Removal Action, Yellow Pine, Idaho, August 2003. Report from Pat Trainor, On Scene Coordinator, USDA - Forest Service, Region 4 - Payette National Forest McCall, Idaho.

MWH (2012) Groundwater Hydrology Baseline Study Work Plan, May 2012.

EXHIBIT 11

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155
Seattle, WA 98101-3188

OFFICE OF
REGIONAL COUNSEL

June 13, 2019

Midas Gold Idaho, Inc.
P.O. Box 429
13181 Hwy 55
Donnelly, ID 83615

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ONLY

Re: Stibnite Mine

Dear Brad,

On April 30, 2019, Midas Gold Corporation provided the Environmental Protection Agency Region 10 (EPA) and the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) with a proposed settlement agreement to undertake a limited initial investigation into existing contamination at the Forest Service Smelter Waste Cell and the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration Dump (DMEA Dump) at the Stibnite Mine Site (Site). This letter pertains to the technical proposal set forth in the statement of work attached to the proposed settlement agreement. As we have discussed, if the government agencies and Midas can agree on the appropriate technical work to be done, we will need to discuss restructuring the agreement so that terms reflect EPA's standard administrative orders on consent. In addition, Midas has not yet substantiated its claim that it is a bona fide prospective purchaser.

On May 17, 2019, Midas met with EPA and IDEQ to explain its technical proposal to the agencies. Midas stated that the goal of performing the work proposed is to discover the sources of elevated levels of arsenic, antimony, and mercury in ground water and/or surface water at the Site. During the meeting, EPA and IDEQ agreed to evaluate the proposal to determine whether the work was appropriate.

After the meeting, EPA invited the United States Forest Service (USFS) to participate in the technical discussions with EPA and IDEQ because the proposed investigatory work involves USFS land. (For the same reason, USFS will need to be a signatory to any final agreement.) We have collectively evaluated the proposal and have concerns that the investigatory work will not achieve the stated purpose. The agencies do not believe that the USFS-constructed repository on the Northwest Bradley Waste Rock Dump is a significant source of the elevated arsenic concentrations measured in monitoring well MWH-A19. The repository was constructed on an elevated portion of the dump that does not contact groundwater. In addition, the repository was constructed with a low-permeability Geosynthetic Clay Liner (GCL) cover to minimize infiltration and percolation through the materials. Groundwater elevation contour data provided by Midas Gold indicates a northerly flow direction, such that MWH-A19 may not be directly downgradient from the repository. Finally, the downgradient monitoring well SRK-GM-03S shows no similarly elevated arsenic or selenium concentrations, which would be expected if the repository were a significant groundwater contaminant source.

As we discussed during the May 17th meeting, the agencies do not believe that Midas Gold's exploration soil sampling data are appropriate for determining background concentrations of metals in surface soils. Midas Gold collected samples from 0–16 inches below ground surface (bgs), with an average and median depth of 9 and 12 inches bgs, respectively. This exceeds the recommended 0–6 inches bgs sampling depth for assessing risk to human health and wildlife. The agencies recommend using the data sets presented in the 1998 Stibnite Site Characterization Report to establish site-specific background concentrations for mineralized and non-mineralized areas. Analysis of the Woodward-Clyde samples indicate an average of 6.99 ppm arsenic for non-mineralized areas. This is consistent with regional norms. The mineralized areas have an average of 87.51 ppm arsenic.

The agencies have discussed other potential projects that may be more successful in achieving the goal of determining the sources of arsenic, antimony and mercury. For instance, additional groundwater, storm event surface water, and sediment samples near the Bradley Waste Rock Dumps, the Keyway Wetland, Upper Wetland, and stream channels of the East Fork South Fork Salmon River, and tributaries upstream of the Sugar Creek confluence would be important work to perform to understand the sources of contamination. We would be happy to discuss in more detail what options the agencies have considered as alternatives to the investigatory work proposed by Midas Gold. Please let me know if you and your client are interested in meeting to have further technical discussions.

Best regards,

Elizabeth McKenna

cc: Lisa O'Hara, Deputy Attorney General IDEQ
Gary Fremerman, USDA OGC

EXHIBIT 12

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

MARTEN LAW

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Elizabeth McKenna
FROM:	Bradley Marten
COPY:	Kathy Cerise, Timothy Maley, Marc Stifelman, Lisa O'Hara, Lisa Carlson, Michael Bogert, Michael MacCurdy, Gary Fremerman, Terry Uhling, Kathy Zamba, Jill Grant, Kelly Wright, Nicholas Pino, Aaron Scheff, Kay Morrison, Susan Hanson, Laurel Sayer, John Meyers
DATE:	November 7, 2019
SUBJECT:	Stibnite Mine CERCLA AOC -- Summary of Tasks Agreed to at November 1, 2019 Meeting

---

This memo summarizes the tasks agreed to at a meeting held at EPA Region X on Friday, November 1, 2019 regarding an Agreed CERCLA Order on Consent ("AOC") and Statement of Work ("SOW") for the Stibnite Mine in Idaho. Present were the following representatives of EPA, the US Forest Service ("USFS"), the Idaho Department of Fish and Wildlife ("DEQ"), the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (the Tribes") and Midas Gold (hereafter, the "AOC Participants")

- Elizabeth McKenna (EPA)
- Kathy Cerise (EPA)
- Timothy Maley (EPA)
- Marc Stifelman (EPA)
- Lisa O'Hara (IDEQ)
- Lisa Carlson (IDEQ)
- Michael Bogert (Midas)
- Michael MacCurdy (IDEQ)
- Gary Fremerman (USFS)
- Kathy Zamba (USFS)
- Jill Grant (Tribes)
- Kelly Wright (Tribes)

- Nicholas Pino (USDA)
- Aaron Scheff (IDEQ)
- Kay Morrison (EPA)
- Susan Hanson (Tribes)
- Laurel Sayer (Midas)
- John Meyers (Midas)
- Bradley Marten (Midas)

1. The AOC Participants agreed not to assert a settlement or other privilege that would bar disclosure of their negotiations (other than the attorney-client privilege) and that their discussions will not be treated as confidential;

2. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, DEQ and USFS asked Midas to fund their participation in the AOC negotiations, using November 1, 2019 as a start date. Midas agreed to consider the request and to propose a Funding and Participation Agreement;

3. The Tribes agreed to provide its comments on the SOW by Tuesday, November 12, 2019, and to meet with the AOC Participants to discuss their comments on Monday, November 18, 2019 at 10 am PST. Midas will circulate a meeting invite and will arrange video conferencing through the Zoom videoconferencing service.

4. EPA agreed to provide a first draft of the AOC by Friday, November 15, 2019, and to meet with the AOC Participants to discuss their comments on Friday, November 22, 2019 at 10 am PST. Midas will circulate a meeting invite and will arrange video conferencing through the Zoom videoconferencing service. Midas Gold's attorney, Brad Marten, agreed to work with EPA's attorney, Elizabeth McKenna, and counsel for the other AOC Participants, to formulate a first draft. The AOC Participants agreed to use EPA model documents in drafting the AOC;

5. Midas agreed to add labelling to the site map it presented at the meeting;

6. EPA noted that it hopes to have an oversight contractor "on-board" within a month and is working through the contracting process;

7. EPA agreed to inform the Nez Perce Tribe of the deadlines agreed to among the AOC Participants and to communicate the AOC Participants' expectation that they will meet the same comment deadlines;

8. Midas agreed to establish a SharePoint Site to make available to the AOC Participants all documents generated by, and necessary to inform, the AOC process. Once the Site is established and operational, all AOC Participants will have access to the SharePoint site, in addition to the Nez Perce Tribe;

9. EPA asked Midas whether it wishes to maintain its claim of confidentiality for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports under the Confidential Business Information ("CBI") exception to the Freedom of Information Act. Midas committed to respond to the request.

EXHIBIT 13

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

Draft Statement of Work for Stibnite Mine RI/FS
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' Comments
November 12, 2019

General Comments and Questions:

1. Many places throughout the document should refer to "analyses" rather than "analysis."
2. Does the Mining Plan of Restoration and Operations (PRO) cover all of Midas Gold's patented land?

Oversight:

Page 3 – The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes ("SBT" or "Tribes") should be listed as an oversight Agency, along with the EPA, USFS and IDEQ. [Note –The term "Agency" in the rest of these comments is intended to include the SBT.]

SBT should receive copies of all reports, etc., because the Tribes plan to comment on these documents as part of their oversight responsibilities. This seems to be what Midas Gold intended, since Attachment E (schedule) refers throughout to "consolidated Agency comments." We added specific references to SBT/Tribes (which could be changed to "Agencies" assuming SBT is added as an "Agency" and assuming that the other Agencies want to be included) where we thought appropriate, just to be sure. For example, on page 3 the last full paragraph should say "Respondent shall submit all documents or deliverables required as part of this SOW to EPA and the Tribes, for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval." The last paragraph should say "Throughout the process of developing the RI/FS, the Respondent shall prepare and submit Quarterly Progress Reports to EPA and the Tribes to aid in project planning."

Roles and Responsibilities:

Page 4 – Please add the underlined language for clarity, since there's a required process for EPA to go through before issuing a ROD: "At the completion of the RI/FS . . . in a Record of Decision (ROD), consistent with the NCP."

Task 1 - Scoping:

Page 4 – "Respondent shall document the specific project scope in the RI/FS Work Plan, which shall be consistent with the AOC." Also, "During the scoping process, the Site- specific objectives of the RI/FS . . . will be proposed by the Respondent but will be determined ~~and approved~~ by EPA."

Page 5 – "When scoping the specific aspects of this project, Respondent shall meet with EPA and the Tribes either in person or telephonically to discuss all project planning decisions and special concerns associated with the Site."

Page 5 – "The Respondent, ~~and~~ EPA and the Tribes shall conduct a Site visit during the project scoping phase."

Page 6 – "The Respondent shall meet with EPA's Remedial Project Manager (RPM) and with the appropriate contact from the Tribes (either in person or telephonically) regarding the following activities and before drafting the scoping deliverables listed below."

Page 7 – Document the Need for Treatability Studies – "Should treatability studies be determined to be necessary, a testing plan . . . should be submitted to EPA and the Tribes for review and for EPA's approval."

Page 7 – Scoping Deliverables – "These plans must be reviewed by EPA and the Tribes and approved by EPA prior to the initiation of field activities."

Page 7 - RI/FS Work Plan – "A Work Plan documenting the decisions and evaluations completed during the scoping process shall be submitted to the RPM and the Tribes for review and for EPA's approval."

Pages 11 through 14 – Potential Target Analytes – The only radiological constituent listed is uranium, and it isn't listed for all media. Since uranium may be a concern, as indicated by it being listed as a COPC for surface water, then uranium and all associated uranium daughters should be listed as COPCs in all media.

Task 2 - Community Relations:

Page 14 – "Respondent may assist by providing information regarding the Site's history, participating in public and community (including tribal community) meetings, and preparing fact sheets for distribution to the general public and relevant tribes, including the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes." All impacted tribes should be included, even though the Shoshoni historically were the main tribes in this area."

Also, "Any PRP-conducted community relations activities will be subject to oversight by EPA and the other Agencies."

Task 3 - Site Characterization

Page 15, 2d ¶ – "The Respondent shall notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies at least two weeks in advance of the field work regarding the planned dates for field activities . . . ."

Same edit in last sentence on pages 15-16: "The Respondent shall notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies at least two weeks prior to initiating field support activities so that EPA may adequately schedule oversight tasks. The Respondent shall also notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies upon completion of field support activities."

Page 17 – "All data and programming, including any proprietary programs, shall be made available to EPA and the Tribes together with a sensitivity analysis.

Page 18 – same edit: "All validated data shall be made available to EPA and the Tribes in electronic format. . . . Field and validated analytical data results for all media sampled shall be submitted to EPA and the Tribes by uploading the data . . . ."

Page 18 – Similarly, "The Respondent shall prepare and submit a draft RI report to the RPM for review and approval, and shall provide a copy of the report to the Tribes."

Page 19 – The Tribes would provide comments on the report, but they could do so directly to Midas Gold or through EPA (see first complete sentence at the top of p. 19).

Page 19 – BLRA – The EPA human health risk assessment must include a tribal scenario.

Task 4 – Treatability Studies

Page 20 – first sentence: "Respondent shall identify in a technical memorandum, subject to EPA and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval, candidate technologies for a treatability studies program during project planning (Task 1)."

Page 20 – Evaluation of Treatability Studies – "Once a decision has been made to perform treatability studies, the Respondent and EPA, in consultation with the Tribes, will decide the types of treatability testing to utilize. . . . the Respondent shall either submit to the RPM and the Tribes a treatability testing work plan or an amendment to the original Site work plan for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval."

Pages 20-21 – Treatability Testing Work Plan – "The Respondent shall prepare a treatability testing work plan or amendment to the original Site Work Plan for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval." Same edit to Treatability Study SAP.

Task 5 – Feasibility Study

Page 22 – "The modified PRGs shall be documented in a technical memorandum that will be reviewed by EPA and the Tribes and approved by EPA."

Attachment C – Suggested RI Report Format

Vegetation results need to be included here so the Tribes can see what has been evaluated. If they aren't included, this will be a major data gap.

EXHIBIT 14

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

Appendix 1

STATEMENT OF WORK FOR THE
STIBNITE MINE REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION / FEASIBILITY STUDY
Valley County ID near Yellow Pine, ID

Purpose

This Statement of Work (SOW) sets forth the requirements for conducting a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) at the Stibnite Mine Site ("Site") located in northwest Idaho approximately 14 miles from the town of Yellow Pine (see Figure 1). The purpose of the RI/FS is to investigate the nature and extent of contamination at the Site and to develop and evaluate remedial alternatives, as appropriate. This SOW provides an overview of Work that will be carried out by Midas Gold Idaho, Inc. ("Midas Gold" or "Respondent") as it implements the RI/FS at the Site.

In September 2016, Midas Gold filed a Plan of Restoration and Operations ("PRO") with the United States Forest Service ("USFS") for the redevelopment of Stibnite, and plans to undertake mining, mineral processing and restoration activities on portions of the Site that will result in landscape-scale changes to many of the existing Site features. As such, the scope and timing of sampling and other elements of the RI/FS will consider potential mining activities in the PRO, any modifications and subsequent remediation must be consistent with the PRO and the subsequent restoration. This will require flexibility in the RI/FS and could require a phased approach to accelerate certain activities.

Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Strikethrough

The Site is defined as the ~~features~~ areas described below (general locations summarized on Figure 2) and the areal extent of contamination from those features and all suitable areas in ~~very~~ close proximity to the contamination necessary for response action implementation:

1. **Yellow Pine Pit (Figure 3)** – The Yellow Pine Pit (formerly known as "The Glory Hole") was actively mined during the 1930s through the 1950s for antimony, tungsten, gold and silver. The pit is located on Midas Gold patented land, and most of the waste rock dumps associated with the pit are adjacent to the pit; some of the waste rock dumps are located on USFS managed land. During active mining, the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River (EFSFSR) was routed around the pit through the Bailey Tunnel but was allowed to return to its natural course through the pit after the Bailey Tunnel was abandoned in the mid-1950s. The EFSFSR now runs through the pit, but does not currently support fish passage to the headwaters. The Yellow Pine Pit, and the majority of waste rock dumps associated with it, are within the footprint of Midas Gold's proposed PRO.

2. **Bradley Tailings Pile (Figure 4)** – The Bradley Tailings Pile, also known as the Historical Tailings and Spent Ore Disposal Area, is located on Midas Gold patented land. Approximately 3 million tons of mine tailings generated during the 1940s and 1950s are stored in this area, and they are overlain by approximately 6 million tons of spent heap leach ore placed in the 1980s and 1990s. The downstream end of the Tailings Pile is constrained by a structure known as the Keyway Dam, and a wetland exists downgradient of the Keyway Dam, which is also referred to as the Keyway Marsh. Meadow Creek is diverted around the south side of the Tailings Pile. The Bradley Tailings Pile is within the footprint of Midas Gold's proposed PRO.

3. **Hangar Flats Tailings Pile (Figure 5)** – The Hangar Flats Tailings Pile, also known as the Hecla Heap Leach Facility, is a reclaimed heap-leach facility which was built and operated in the 1990s to extract oxide gold and silver. The facility is located on Midas Gold controlled patented land, and is within the footprint of Midas Gold's proposed PRO.

4. **Bailey Tunnel (Figure 6)** – The Bailey Tunnel was constructed in the early 1940s to divert the EFSFSR around the Yellow Pine Pit and into Sugar Creek to facilitate open pit mining operations. The tunnel was no longer used after the mid-1950s, following cessation of open pit mining activities. The Bailey Tunnel is on Midas Gold patented land, and is within the footprint of Midas Gold's proposed PRO.

5. **DMEA Adit and Waste Rock Dump (Figure 7)** – The Defense Minerals Exploration Administration (DMEA) Adit and Waste Rock Dump are mining-related disturbances resulting from underground exploration activities during the 1950s. The adit and dump are located on USFS managed land, and are not within the footprint of the Midas Gold PRO.

6. **Bonanza Adit (Figure 8)** – The Bonanza Adit area is a mining-related disturbance in the Sugar Creek drainage resulting from underground exploration activities during the 1930s and 1940s. The Bonanza Adit area is located on USFS managed land, and is not within the footprint of the Midas Gold PRO.

7. **Cinnabar Tunnel (Figure 9)** – The Cinnabar Tunnel is a mining-related disturbance resulting from underground exploration activities during the late 1920s and early 1930s. The Tunnel is located on USFS managed land; the tunnel portal is within the footprint of the Midas Gold PRO.

8. **Meadow Creek Adit (Figure 10)** – The Meadow Creek Adit and associated waste rock dumps are mining-related disturbances that resulted from underground mining activities from the 1920s through the 1940s. The adit and waste rock dumps are located on Midas Gold controlled patented land, and are within the footprint of Midas Gold's proposed PRO.

This RI/FS SOW is attached to and is incorporated into the Settlement Agreement and Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) for the Site. Technical work described in this SOW is intended to provide more information to the Respondent for the purpose of implementing the AOC and is not intended to change the meaning of any AOC language. This SOW is also consistent with both the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. § 9601 et seq., and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, commonly called the National Contingency Plan (NCP), 40 CFR 300. The AOC and this SOW are hereafter referred to interchangeably as the "AOC." Any discrepancies between the AOC and this SOW are unintended, and whenever necessary, the AOC will control any interpretive disputes.

Scope

The specific RI/FS activities to be conducted at the Site are set forth in ~~seven~~ six separate tasks.

Task 1 – Scoping
Task 2 – Community Relations
Task 3 – Site Characterization
Task 4 – Treatability Studies
Task 5 – Feasibility Study
Task 6 – Detailed Analysis of Remedial Alternatives

Oversight

Work conducted under the AOC is intended to satisfy the legal requirements for the RI/FS established under both Section 104(a)(l) of CERCLA and Idaho's Environmental Protection & Health Act, Idaho Code§§ 39-101 to 39-130; the Hazardous Waste Management Act of ldaho, Idaho Code§§ 39-4401 to 39-4432; and Idaho's Water Quality Act, Idaho Code§§ 39-3601 et seq. As such, oversight of the Respondent's Work conducted under the SOW will be carried out by EPA, the USFS, and the IDEQ (the Agencies) in a manner to assure the satisfaction of all federal and state requirements. The Respondent shall support the Agencies' initiation and conduct of activities related to the implementation of oversight activities.

Respondent shall submit all documents or deliverables required as part of this SOW to EPA, for EPA's review and approval. All work products submitted to EPA are subject to EPA approval, including but not limited to, submissions specified in the Work Plan(s) or Settlement Agreement and additional work products that may be required under Work Plan modifications. Respondent shall ensure that all plans, reports, and records are comprehensive, accurate, and consistent in content and format with the NCP and relevant EPA guidance.

Commented [LO1]: Although EPA is lead agency, there are several reference to "EPA's review and approval" that should also include the support agencies' role in review/comment for submittals. Instead of EPA, use of "Agencies approval" or "for Agencies' review and approval" to include DEQ, Forest Service and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Perhaps language in the Introduction section could be added to clarify EPA as lead agency with DEQ, Forest Service & and Shoshone Bannock as support agencies.

Commented [LO2]: Same as comment 1

Throughout the process of developing the RI/FS, the Respondent shall prepare and submit Quarterly Progress Reports to EPA to aid in project planning. These reports must document the status of all work products under development. These reports shall describe

the actions and decisions taken, and problems encountered during the previous quarter, and activities scheduled during the upcoming reporting period. Progress reports shall also summarize the extent to which the procedures and dates set forth in the AOC and the Work Plan are being met. These reports shall be submitted according to the Schedule included as Attachment E.

Schedule

Refer to Attachment E for the primary and potential secondary deliverables and associated schedules.

Guidance

The Respondent shall conduct the RI/FS, and produce technical reports that are in accordance with the AOC, SOW, the Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA (RI/FS Guidance) (U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, October 1988), and any other guidance relevant to conducting an RI/FS. A list of the pertinent guidance documents is included at the end on this SOW. Attachments A, B, C, and D include suggested document formats for the Work Plan, Sampling and Analysis Plan, RI Report, and FS Report, respectively. The RI/FS guidance describes the required report contents.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Respondent shall furnish all necessary personnel, materials, and services needed, or incidental to, performing the RI/FS, except as otherwise specified in the AOC. At the completion of the RI/FS, EPA will be responsible for the selection of a Site remedy and will document this selection in a Record of Decision (ROD).

Commented [LO3]: Will support agencies be asked/required to concur in selection of a remedy?

Remedy Requirements

The remedial action alternative selected by the EPA will meet the cleanup standards specified in Section 121 of CERCLA. That is, the selected remedial action will be protective of human health and the environment, will be in compliance with, or include a waiver of, applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) of other laws, will be cost-effective, will utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies or resource recovery technologies, to the maximum extent practicable, and will address the statutory preference for treatment as a principal element. The final RI/FS report including the baseline risk assessment (BLRA), as adopted by the EPA, will, with the administrative record, form the basis for the selection of the Site's remedy and will provide the information necessary to support the development of the ROD.

TASK 1 - SCOPING

Scoping is the initial planning process of the RI/FS. Respondent shall document the specific project scope in the RI/FS Work Plan. During the scoping process, the Site-

specific objectives of the RI/FS, including the identification of potential preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) will be proposed by the Respondent and approved by EPA. In addition to developing the Site-specific objectives of the RI/FS, Respondent shall define a general project management approach for the Site, which shall be documented by the Respondent in a draft Work Plan. Because the Work required to perform an RI/FS is not fully known at the outset and is phased in accordance with a Site's complexity and the amount of available information, it may be necessary to modify the Work Plan during the RI/FS to satisfy the objectives of the study. When scoping the specific aspects of this project, Respondent shall meet with EPA either in person or telephonically to discuss all project planning decisions and special concerns associated with the Site.

Commented [LO4]: Same as comment 1

The following activities shall be performed by the Respondent as a function of the project planning process.

a. *Site Background*

The Respondent shall gather, analyze, and present existing Site background information and shall conduct a work session to assist in planning the scope of the RI/FS.

Collect and analyze existing data and document the need for additional data

Before planning RI/FS activities, all existing Site data shall be thoroughly compiled and reviewed by the Respondent. Historical data shall be submitted electronically according to EPA Region 10 specifications. The Respondent shall refer to Table 2-1 of the RI/FS Guidance for a comprehensive list of data collection information sources. Specifically, this must include presently available data relating to the varieties and quantities of hazardous substances at the Site, and past disposal practices. This must also include results from any previous sampling events that may have been conducted. Only data that is determined by EPA to be of appropriate type and quality to support specific intended uses shall be utilized in the RI/FS. This includes data utilized to develop the BLRA, to identify additional data needs to better characterize the Site, to better define potential applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), and to develop a range of preliminarily identified remedial alternatives. Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) shall be established, subject to EPA's approval, which shall be used to assess the usefulness of existing data and to direct future data gathering efforts. Decisions regarding the necessary data needs and DQOs will be made by EPA. Guidance on systematic planning using the data quality objectives process (EPA QA/G-4). Washington, D.C.: 121. http://www.epa.gov/quality/qs-docs/g4-final.pdf, U.S. EPA (2006)

Commented [LO5]: Same as comment 1

Conduct site visit

The Respondent and EPA shall conduct a Site visit during the project scoping phase to assist in developing a conceptual understanding of sources and areas of contamination as well as potential exposure pathways and receptors at the Site. During the Site visit the Respondent shall observe the Site's physiography, hydrology, geology, and demographics, as well as natural resource, ecological, and

cultural resources. This information shall be utilized to better scope the project and to determine the extent of additional data necessary to characterize the Site, better define potential ARARs, and assist in identifying potential remedial alternatives.

b. Project Planning

Once the Respondent has collected and analyzed existing data and conducted a Site visit, the specific project scope shall be planned. Project planning activities include those tasks described below, as well as identifying data needs, developing a work plan, designing a data collection program, and identifying health and safety protocols. The Respondent shall meet with EPA's Remedial Project Manager (RPM) regarding the following activities and before drafting the scoping deliverables listed below.

Preliminary conceptual site model

Information on the waste sources, pathways, receptors, cultural resources, and other information concerning the Site is used to develop a conceptual understanding of the Site which helps to evaluate potential risks to human health and the environment. The Conceptual Site Model (CSM) should include known and suspected sources of contamination, types of contamination and affected media/resources, known and potential routes of migration, and known or potential human and environmental receptors. This effort, in addition to assisting in identification of locations where sampling is necessary, will also assist in the identification of potential remedial technologies. Additional information for evaluating exposure concerns through the use of a CSM is provided in the DQO Guidance. The CSM must be updated as new information becomes available.

The preliminary CSM associated with the ecological risk assessment (ERA) must include species and their habitats that could be impacted by Site-related contamination based on information generated from a historical review and a cultural resource audit and will show the relationships among species and potential exposure pathways. The Respondent shall provide assistance to the RPM in collecting this information as requested. If information is not provided to the Respondent within the timeframe specified by EPA, the RPM will notify the Respondent in writing either to proceed with the preparation of the RI/FS Work Plan without the information or to delay its submittal pending receipt of the information. The preliminary CSM for the human health risk assessment (HHRA) must identify potential receptor populations and potential exposure pathways.

Refine and document preliminary remedial action objectives and alternatives

Once existing Site information has been analyzed and an understanding of the potential Site risks have been determined, the Respondent shall review and, if necessary, refine the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) that have been identified by EPA for each actually or potentially contaminated medium. The revised RAOs

must be documented in a technical memorandum and subject to EPA's approval. The Respondent shall then identify a preliminary comprehensive range of potential remedial action alternatives and associated technologies. The range of potential alternatives shall encompass, where appropriate, alternatives in which treatment significantly reduces the toxicity, mobility, or volume of the waste; alternatives that involve containment with little or no treatment; and a no-action alternative.

Commented [LO6]: Same as comment 1

Document the need for treatability studies

Respondent shall conduct bench and/or pilot studies as necessary to determine the suitability of various remedial technologies to Site conditions and problems. Technologies that may be suitable to the Site should be identified as early as possible to determine whether there is a need to conduct treatability studies to better estimate costs and performance capabilities. Should treatability studies be determined to be necessary, a testing plan identifying the types and goals of the studies, the level of effort needed, a schedule for completion, and the data management guidelines should be submitted to EPA for review and approval. Upon EPA approval, a test facility and any necessary equipment, vendors, and analytical services will be procured by the contractor.

When the treatability studies are completed, Respondent shall evaluate the results to assess the technologies with respect to the goals identified in the test plan. A report summarizing the testing program and its results shall be prepared by the Respondent and presented in the final RI/FS report. The Respondent shall implement all management and quality control review activities for this task. If remedial actions involving treatment have been identified by the Respondent or EPA, treatability studies shall be required, except where the Respondent can demonstrate to the satisfaction of EPA that they are not needed. Where treatability studies are needed, initial treatability testing activities (such as research and study design) should be planned to occur concurrently with Site characterization activities.

Begin preliminary identification of potential ARARs

The Respondent shall conduct a preliminary identification of potential ARARs (chemical-specific, location-specific, and action-specific) to assist in the refinement of the RAOs and the initial identification of remedial alternatives. ARAR identification will continue as Site conditions, contaminants, and remedial action alternatives are better defined.

c. Scoping Deliverables

At the conclusion of the project planning phase, the Respondent shall submit an RI/FS Work Plan, a Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) consisting of a Field Sampling Plan (FSP) and Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), and a Site Health and Safety Plan (HASP). These plans must be reviewed and approved by EPA prior to the initiation of field activities.

RI/FS Work Plan

A Work Plan documenting the decisions and evaluations completed during the scoping process shall be submitted to the RPM for review and approval. The Work Plan will ~~fully account~~ take in to consideration for the timing and scope of potential mining and processing activities associated with the PRO. This could include a phased approach to focus on issues of most concern or requiring early action. The Work Plan shall be developed in conjunction with the SAP and the Site HASP, although each plan may be delivered under separate cover. The Work Plan shall include a comprehensive description of the work to be performed, including the methodologies to be utilized, as well as a corresponding schedule for completion. In addition, the Work Plan shall include the rationale for performing the required activities. Specifically, the Work Plan must present a statement of the problem(s) and potential problem(s) posed by the Site and the objectives of the RI/FS. Furthermore, the plan must include a Site background summary setting forth the Site description including the geographic location of the Site, and to the extent possible, a description of the Site's physiography, hydrology, hydrogeology, geology, demographics, ecological, cultural, and natural resource features; a synopsis of the Site history and a description of previous responses that have been conducted at the Site by local, state, federal, or private parties; and a summary of the existing data in terms of physical and chemical characteristics of the contaminants identified, and their distribution among the environmental media at the Site. In addition, the plan must include a description of the Respondent's Site management strategy developed during scoping and a preliminary identification of remedial alternatives and data needs for evaluation of remedial alternatives. The plan must reflect coordination with treatability study requirements, if treatability studies are initiated. It must include a process for and manner of identifying potential ARARs (chemical-specific, location-specific, and action-specific).

Commented [LO7]: Same as comment 1

Formatted: Strikethrough

Finally, the major part of the Work Plan is a detailed description of the tasks to be performed, information needed for each task and for the BLRA, information to be produced during and at the conclusion of each task, and a description of the work products that will be submitted to the RPM. This includes the deliverables set forth in the remainder of this SOW; a schedule for each of the required activities which is consistent with the RI/FS guidance; and a project management plan, including a data management plan (e.g., requirements for project management systems and software, minimum data requirements, data format and backup data management), monthly reports to the RPM and meetings and presentations to EPA and the Support Agencies at the conclusion of each major phase of the RI/FS. The Respondent must refer to Appendix B of the RI/FS Guidance for a comprehensive description of the contents of the required Work Plan, and a suggested format can be found in Attachment A.

Sampling and Analysis Plan

The Respondent shall prepare a SAP to ensure that sample collection and analytical activities are conducted in accordance with technically acceptable protocols and that the data meet DQOs. The SAP provides a mechanism for planning field activities and consists of a FSP and a QAPP. A suggested format for the SAP (inclusive of the FSP and QAPP) is provided in Attachment B. The SAP, FSP, and QAPP shall be prepared in accordance with EPA DQO guidance documents (EPA 2000, 2002a, 2002b, and 2006).

The FSP must define in detail the sampling and data-gathering methods that will be used on the project. It must include sampling objectives, sample location and frequency, sampling equipment and procedures, and sample handling and analysis. The QAPP must describe the project objectives and organization, functional activities, and quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) protocols that will be used to achieve the desired DQOs. The DQOs shall, at a minimum, reflect use of analytic methods to identify contamination and remediate contamination consistent with the levels for remedial action objectives identified in the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), pages 51425-26 and 51433 (December 21, 1988). The QAPP shall be prepared in accordance with requirements in EPA QA/R-5 *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans* (latest draft or revision) and EPA QA/G-5 *EPA Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans* (latest draft or revision) and specifically should contain the twenty-four elements specified in Table 11 – List of QA Project Plan Elements, EPA QA/G-4HW Data Quality Objectives Process for Hazardous Waste Site Investigations, and EPA QA/G-4 Guidance for the Data Quality Objective Process. All sampling and analyses performed pursuant to this SOW shall conform to EPA direction, approval, and guidance regarding sampling, QA/QC, data validation, and chain-of-custody procedures. In addition, the QAPP must address the following: sampling procedures; sample custody; analytical procedures; data reduction, validation, and reporting; and personnel qualifications.

Field personnel must be trained and conduct work in accordance with EPA and OSHA requirements and guidance. The Respondent shall demonstrate, in advance and to the satisfaction of EPA, that each laboratory they may use is qualified to conduct the proposed work. This includes use of methods and analytical protocols for the chemicals of concern in the media of interest within detection and quantification limits consistent with both QA/QC procedures and DQOs approved in the QAPP for the Site by EPA. The laboratory must have and follow an approved QA program. If a laboratory not in the Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) is selected, methods consistent with CLP methods that would be used at this Site for the purposes proposed and QA/QC procedures approved by EPA will be used. If the laboratory is not in the CLP program, a laboratory QA program must be submitted for EPA's review and approval. EPA may require that the Respondent submit detailed information to demonstrate that the laboratory is qualified to conduct the work, including information on personnel qualifications, equipment,

and material specifications. The Respondent shall provide assurances that EPA has access to laboratory personnel, equipment, and records for sample collection, transportation, and analysis.

Potential Target Analytes

The following list of chemicals include the initial Chemicals of Potential Concern (COPCs). The initial COPC list includes, but is not limited to, the analytes listed below. The Respondent shall review this list for surface water, groundwater, sediments, soils, and vegetation analytes relative to ARARs, preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), screening levels, Site-specific risk assessment data needs, treatability study data needs, feasibility study data needs, and other potential performance standards. All metal analytes (aqueous) shall be analyzed for total and dissolved constituents unless otherwise approved by EPA. Analytes may be added and/or removed from further consideration or monitored at varying frequencies based upon Site-specific factors such as dry or wet year hydrologic cycles as approved or otherwise directed by EPA.

Chemicals/Analytes of Potential Concern for Surface Water

The preliminary COPC list is shown below. These COPCs will be screened in the initial data compilation and review process to identify the COPC list for surface water sampling stations during the first high flow (spring runoff) and the first low flow (fall) sampling events conducted following signing of the AOC. The spring runoff sampling event shall be conducted as close as possible to the peak of the spring runoff hydrograph. A minimum of two storm event sampling events shall be conducted.

Laboratory Analyses

- Alkalinity
- Aluminum
- Antimony
- Arsenic
- Barium
- Beryllium
- Boron
- Cadmium
- Calcium
- Chloride
- Chromium (III)
- Chromium (VI)
- Cobalt
- Copper
- Hardness
- Iron
- Lead
- Magnesium

- Manganese
- Mercury
- Molybdenum
- Nickel
- Nitrogen, total Kjeldahl
- Phosphorus
- Potassium
- Selenium
- Silver
- Sodium
- Sulphate
- Thallium
- Tungsten
- Total Dissolved Solids
- Total Organic Carbon
- Total Suspended Solids
- Uranium
- Vanadium
- Zinc

Field Analyses
- Conductivity
- Dissolved Oxygen
- Flow
- pH
- Temperature

The Respondent shall review the results of the first year's surface water sampling, shall compare the analytical results for each of the COPCs against the screening levels, and shall recommend COPCs to be eliminated from the above list for subsequent surface water sampling events. Upon approval by EPA, the COPCs eliminated by this process do not need to be included in the analyses for subsequent surface water sampling events.

Commented [LO8]: Same as comment 1

Chemicals/Analytes of Potential Concern for Sediments:

The preliminary COPC list is shown below. These COPCs will be screened in the initial data compilation and review process to identify the COPC list for sediment sampling stations.

Laboratory Analyses
- Antimony
- Arsenic
- Cadmium
- Chromium
- Copper
- Lead

- Manganese
- Mercury
- Nickel
- Selenium
- Silver
- Tungsten
- Vanadium
- Zinc

Chemicals/Analytes of Potential Concern for Soils/Waste Rock:

The preliminary COPC list is shown below. These COPCs will be screened in the initial data compilation and review process to identify the COPC list for soils/waste rock sampling.

Laboratory Analyses

- Antimony
- Arsenic
- Boron
- Cadmium
- Chromium
- Cobalt
- Copper
- Lead
- Manganese
- Mercury
- Molybdenum
- Nickel
- Selenium
- Silver
- Thallium
- Tungsten
- Uranium
- Vanadium
- Zinc

Chemicals/Analytes of Potential Concern for Vegetation:

The preliminary COPC list is shown below. These COPCs will be screened in the initial data compilation and review process to identify the COPC list for vegetation sampling stations.

Laboratory Analyses

- Antimony
- Arsenic
- Boron
- Cadmium

- Chromium
- Cobalt
- Copper
- Lead
- Manganese
- Mercury
- Molybdenum
- Nickel
- Selenium
- Silver
- Thallium
- Tungsten
- Vanadium
- Zinc

Chemicals/Analytes of Potential Concern for Groundwater

The preliminary COPC list is shown below. These COPCs will be screened in the initial data compilation and review process to identify the COPC list for groundwater sampling stations and shall be sampled at a minimum during the first high flow (spring runoff) and the first low flow (fall) sampling events conducted following signing of the AOC. The spring runoff sampling event shall be conducted as close as possible to the peak of the spring runoff hydrograph and the low flow sampling shall be conducted at all groundwater sampling stations as close as possible to the low point of the surface water flow hydrograph.

Laboratory Analyses

- Alkalinity
- Aluminum
- Antimony
- Arsenic
- Barium
- Beryllium
- Cadmium
- Calcium
- Chloride
- Chromium III
- Chromium VI
- Cobalt
- Copper
- Hardness
- Iron
- Magnesium
- Manganese
- Mercury
- Molybdenum
- Nickel

- Nitrate/nitrite as N
- Nitrogen (TKN)
- Orthophosphate
- Potassium
- Selenium
- Silver
- Sodium
- Sulfate
- Thallium
- Total Dissolved Solids
- Total Suspended Solids
- Total Organic Carbon
- Tungsten
- Uranium
- Vanadium
- Zinc

Field Analyses

- Conductivity
- Dissolved Oxygen or ORP
- Ferric Iron
- Ferrous Iron
- Nitrite
- pH
- Temperature

The Respondent shall review the results of the first year's groundwater sampling, shall compare the analytical results for each of the COPCs against the screening levels, and shall recommend COPCs to be eliminated from the above list for subsequent groundwater sampling events. Upon approval by EPA, the COPCs eliminated by this process do not need to be included in the analyses for subsequent groundwater sampling events.

Site Health and Safety Plan

A HASP shall be prepared in conformance with the Respondent's health and safety program, and in compliance with OSHA regulations and protocols. It should be noted that EPA does not "approve" the Respondent's health and safety plan, but rather EPA reviews it to ensure that all necessary elements are included, and that the plan provides for the protection of human health and the environment.

TASK 2 - COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The development and implementation of community relations activities are the responsibility of EPA. The critical community relations planning steps performed by EPA include conducting community interviews and developing a community relations plan. Although implementation of the community relations plan is the responsibility of EPA, the

Commented [LO9]: Only EPA or Support Agencies too?

Respondent may assist by providing information regarding the Site's history, participating in public meetings, and preparing fact sheets for distribution to the general public. In addition, the Respondent shall establish a community information repository, at or near the City of McCall, to house one copy of the administrative record. The extent of community relations activities involvement by potentially responsible parties (PRPs) is left to the discretion of EPA. The Respondent's community relations responsibilities, if any, are specified in the community relations plan. Any PRP-conducted community relations activities will be subject to oversight by EPA.

TASK 3 - SITE CHARACTERIZATION

As part of the RI, the Respondent shall perform the activities described in this task, including the preparation of a Site characterization summary and a RI report. The overall objective of Site characterization is to describe areas of a Site that may pose a threat to human health or the environment. This is accomplished by first determining a Site's physiography, geology, and hydrology/hydrogeology. Surface and subsurface pathways of migration must be defined. The Respondent shall identify the sources of contamination and define the nature, extent, and volume of the sources of contamination, including their physical and chemical constituents as well as their background concentrations at incremental locations in the affected media. The Respondent shall also investigate the extent of migration of this contamination as well as its volume and any changes in its physical or chemical characteristics, to provide for a comprehensive understanding of the nature and extent of contamination at the Site. Using this information, contaminant fate and transport is then determined and projected.

During this phase of the RI/FS, the Work Plan, SAP, and HASP are implemented. Field data are collected and analyzed to provide the information required to accomplish the objectives of the study. The Respondent shall notify the RPM at least two weeks in advance of the field work regarding the planned dates for field activities, including ecological field surveys, field layout of the sampling grid, excavation, installation of wells, initiating sampling, installation and calibration of equipment, pump tests, and initiation of analysis and other field investigation activities. The Respondent shall demonstrate that the laboratory and type of laboratory analyses that will be utilized during Site characterization meet the specific QA/QC requirements and the DQOs of the Site investigation as specified in the SAP. In view of the unknown Site conditions, activities are often iterative, and to satisfy the objectives of the RI/FS, it may be necessary for the Respondent to supplement the work specified in the initial Work Plan. In addition to the deliverables below, the Respondent shall provide a monthly progress report and participate in weekly meetings or conference calls at major points in the RI/FS.

Commented [LO10]: Notification to Support Agencies also.

a. Field Investigation

The field investigation shall include the gathering of data to define Site physical and biological characteristics, sources of contamination, and the nature and extent of contamination at the Site. These activities shall be performed by the Respondent in accordance with the Work Plan and SAP. At a minimum, this shall address the following:

Implement and document field support activities

The Respondent shall initiate field support activities following approval of the Work Plan and SAP. Field support activities may include obtaining access to the Site, scheduling, and procuring equipment, office space, laboratory services, and/or contractors. The Respondent shall notify the RPM at least two weeks prior to initiating field support activities so that EPA may adequately schedule oversight tasks. The Respondent shall also notify the RPM upon completion of field support activities.

Investigate and define site physical and biological characteristics

The Respondent shall collect data on the physical and biological characteristics of the Site and its surrounding areas, including the physiography, geology, and hydrology, and specific physical characteristics identified in the work plan. This information must be ascertained through a combination of physical measurements, observations, and sampling efforts, and will be utilized to define potential transport pathways and human, cultural, and ecological receptor populations. In defining the Site's physical characteristics, the Respondent shall also obtain sufficient engineering data (such as the effects of contaminated media weathering and ground and surface water contaminant loading) to aid in the projection of contaminant fate and transport, and the development and screening of remedial action alternatives, including information to assess treatment technologies.

Define sources of contamination

The Respondent shall locate each source of contamination and define the areal extent and depth of contamination associated with each source in all media. The physical characteristics and chemical constituents and their concentrations must be determined for all known and discovered sources of contamination. The Respondent shall conduct sufficient sampling to define the boundaries of the contaminant sources consistent with the QAPP and DQOs.

Defining the source of contamination must include analyzing the potential for contaminant release (e.g., long term leaching from soil), contaminant mobility and persistence over time, and characteristics important for evaluating remedial actions, including information to assess treatment technologies.

~~Describe~~ Delineate the nature and extent of contamination

The Respondent shall gather information to ~~describe~~ delineate the nature and extent of contamination as a final step during the field investigation. To describe the nature and extent of contamination, the Respondent must utilize the information and site physical and biological characteristics and sources of contamination to give a preliminary estimate of the contaminants that may have migrated. The Respondent shall then implement an iterative monitoring program and any study program identified in the work plan or SAP such that by using analytical techniques sufficient to detect and quantify the concentration of

contaminants, the migration of contaminants through the various media at the Site can be determined. In addition, the Respondent shall gather data for calculations of contaminant fate and transport. This process must be continued until the area and depth of contamination are known. This information will be used to determine the level of risk presented by the Site and to help develop appropriate remedial action alternatives for evaluation.

b. *Data Analyses*

Evaluate Site characteristics

The Respondent shall analyze and evaluate the data to describe: (1) Site physical and biological characteristics; (2) contaminant source characteristics; (3) nature and extent of contamination; and (4) contaminant fate and transport. Results of the Site physical characteristics, source characteristics, and extent of contamination analyses are utilized in the analysis of contaminant fate and transport. The evaluation must include the actual and potential magnitude of releases from the sources, and horizontal and vertical spread of contamination as well as mobility and persistence of contaminants. Where modeling is appropriate, such models shall be identified to EPA in a technical memorandum prior to their use. All data and programming, including any proprietary programs, shall be made available to EPA together with a sensitivity analysis. The RI data shall be presented in a format (i.e., computer disc or equivalent) to facilitate the preparation of the BLRA. The validated data, along with QA/QC information and data validation summaries, shall be submitted in electronic format within 90 calendar days from the date of collection of the last sample from each sampling event. The Respondent shall then collect any data required to address data gaps identified by EPA as needed to complete the BLRA. This evaluation shall also provide information relevant to Site characteristics necessary to evaluate the need for remedial action in the BLRA and to aid in the development and evaluation of remedial alternatives. Analyses of data collected for Site characterization must meet the DQOs developed in the QA/QC plan stated in the SAP (or as revised during the RI).

c. *Data Management Procedures*

The Respondent shall consistently document the quality and validity of field and laboratory data compiled during the RI.

Document field activities

Information gathered during Site characterization shall be consistently documented and adequately recorded by the Respondent in well-maintained field logs and laboratory reports. The method(s) of documentation must be specified in the work plan and/or the SAP. Field logs must be utilized to document observations, measurements, and significant events that have occurred during field activities. Laboratory reports must document sample custody, analytical responsibility,

analytical results, adherence to prescribed protocols, nonconformity events, corrective measures, and/or data deficiencies.

Maintain sample management and tracking

The Respondent shall maintain field reports, sample shipment records, analytical results, and QA/QC reports to ensure that only validated analytical data are reported and utilized in the development and evaluation of remedial alternatives. Analytical results developed under the Work Plan must not be included in any Site characterization reports unless accompanied by or cross-referenced to a corresponding QA/QC report. In addition, the Respondent shall establish a data security system to safeguard chain-of-custody forms and other project records to prevent loss, damage, or alteration of project documentation.

Data validation management

All validated data shall be made available to EPA in electronic format. The validated data, along with QA/QC information and data validation summaries, shall be submitted in electronic format within 90 calendar days from the date of collection of the last sample from each sampling event. Field and validated analytical data results for all media sampled shall be submitted to EPA by uploading the data to the Water Quality Exchange (WQX) using the Central Data Exchange (CDX). Field and laboratory samples must include information on the sampling locations which will also be submitted to WQX via CDX. (See www.epa.gov/storet/wqx.hmtl)

d. Site Characterization Deliverables

The Respondent shall prepare the preliminary Site characterization summary and the RI report.

Data Summary Reports

After completing each annual field season's sampling and analysis (i.e., at the end of the field season each calendar year), the Respondent shall prepare a concise Site characterization Data Summary Report (DSR). This report must review the investigative activities that have taken place and describe and display Site data documenting the location and characteristics of surface and subsurface features and contamination at the Site, including the affected media, locations, types, physical state, concentrations of contaminants and quantities. In addition, reports shall document the location, dimensions, physical condition and varying concentrations of each contaminant for each source and the extent of contaminant migration through each of the affected media. Each DSR must also evaluate data gaps and identify additional and/or modified sampling and analysis that shall be included in modifications to the SAP for each subsequent field season. If acceptable to EPA, the DSR following the final field season of data collection can be eliminated as a separate deliverable, and the information collected during the final field season can be presented in the RI report.

Remedial Investigation Report (RI)

The Respondent shall prepare and submit a draft RI report to the RPM for review and approval. This report shall summarize results of field activities to characterize the Site, sources of contamination, nature and extent of contamination, and the fate and transport of contaminants. The Respondent shall refer to the RI/FS Guidance for an outline of the report format and contents, and a suggested format for the RI report can be found in Attachment C. Following comment by EPA, the Respondent shall prepare a final RI report satisfactorily addressing the comments.

Commented [LO11]: Same as comment 1

Baseline Risk Assessment (BLRA)

The Respondent shall conduct a BLRA to assess the potential human health, and environmental risks posed by the Site in the absence of any remedial action, but will consider implementation of the PRO. This effort will involve four components: contaminant identification, exposure assessment, toxicity assessment, and risk characterization.

Contaminant Identification – The Respondent shall review available information on all hazardous substances present at the Site and identify the major contaminants of concern. Contaminants of concern should be selected based on their intrinsic toxicological properties because they are present in large quantities, and/or because they are currently in, or potentially may migrate into, critical exposure pathways (e.g., drinking water).

Exposure Assessment – The Respondent shall identify actual or potential exposure pathways, characterize potentially exposed populations, and evaluate the actual or potential extent of exposure.

Toxicity Assessment – The Respondent shall provide a toxicity assessment of those chemicals found to be of concern during Site investigation activities. This will involve an assessment of the types of adverse health or environmental effects associated with chemical exposures, the relationship between magnitude of exposures and adverse effects, and the related uncertainties for contaminant toxicity, (e.g., weight of evidence for a chemical's carcinogenicity). EPA has prepared chemical screening tables with updated toxicity values and Preliminary Remediation Goals for various land uses available from: https://www.epa.gov/risk/regional-screening-levels-rsls-generic-tables

Risk Characterization – The Respondent shall integrate information developed during the exposure and toxicity assessments to characterize the current or potential risk to human health and/or the environment posed by the Site. This characterization should identify the potential for adverse health or environmental effects for the chemicals of concern and identify any uncertainties associated with contaminant(s), toxicity(ies), and /or exposure assumptions.

TASK 4 - TREATABILITY STUDIES

If potential remedial actions involving treatment have been identified by Respondent or EPA, Respondent shall conduct treatability studies except where Respondent can demonstrate to the satisfaction of EPA that they are not needed. The following activities shall be performed by the Respondent to support all treatability studies.

a. Determination of Candidate Technologies and of Need for Testing

The Respondent shall identify in a technical memorandum, subject to EPA review and approval, candidate technologies for a treatability studies program during project planning (Task 1). The listing of candidate technologies must cover the range of technologies required for the development and analysis of alternatives (Task 5 and 6) The specific data requirements for the testing program will be determined and refined during site characterization and the development and screening of remedial alternatives (Tasks 3, 5, and 6).

Commented [LO12]: Same as comment 1

Conduct literature survey and determine the need for treatability testing

The Respondent shall conduct a literature survey to gather information of performance, relative costs, applicability, removal efficiencies, operation and maintenance (O&M) requirements, and implementability of candidate technologies. If practical candidate technologies have not been sufficiently demonstrated or cannot be adequately evaluated for this Site based on available information, treatability testing must be conducted. Where it is determined by EPA that treatability testing is required, and unless the Respondent can demonstrate to EPA's satisfaction that it is not needed, the Respondent shall submit a SOW to the RPM outlining the steps and data necessary to evaluate and initiate the treatability testing program.

Evaluation of treatability studies

Once a decision has been made to perform treatability studies, the Respondent and EPA will decide the types of treatability testing to utilize (e.g., bench and/or pilot). Because of the time required to design, fabricate, and install pilot scale equipment as well as perform testing for various operating conditions, the decision to perform pilot testing should be made as early in the process as possible to minimize potential delays of the FS. To assure that a treatability testing program is completed on time, and with accurate results, the Respondent shall either submit to the RPM a treatability testing work plan or an amendment to the original Site work plan for EPA's review and approval.

Commented [LO13]: Same as comment 1

b. Treatability Testing and Deliverables

The deliverables that are required, in addition to the memorandum identifying candidate technologies, where treatability testing is conducted, include a work plan, a sampling and analysis plan, and a final treatability evaluation report. EPA may also require a treatability study health and safety plan, where appropriate.

Treatability testing work plan

The Respondent shall prepare a treatability testing work plan or amendment to the original Site Work Plan for EPA's review and approval, describing the Site background, remedial technology(ies) to be tested, test objectives, experimental procedures, treatability conditions to be tested, measurements of performance, analytical methods, data management and analysis, health and safety, and residual waste management. The DQOs for treatability testing must be documented as well. If pilot scale treatability testing is to be performed, the pilot scale work plan will describe pilot plant installation and start-up, pilot plant operation and maintenance procedures, operating conditions to be tested, a sampling plan to determine pilot plant performance, and a detailed health and safety plan. If testing is to be performed off-site, permitting requirements must be addressed.

Treatability study SAP

If the original QAPP or FSP does not address activities to be performed during the treatability tests, a separate treatability study SAP or amendment to the original Site SAP must be prepared by the Respondent for EPA's review and approval. Task 1, Item c. of this statement of work provides additional information on the requirements of the SAP.

Treatability study HASP

If the original HASP is not adequate for defining the activities to be performed during the treatment tests, a separate or amended HASP must be developed by the Respondent. Task 1, Item c, of this SOW provides additional information on the requirements of the health and safety plan. EPA does not "approve" the treatability study HASP.

Treatability study evaluation report

Following completion of treatability testing, the Respondent shall analyze and interpret the testing results in a technical report to EPA. Depending on the sequence of activities, this report may be a part of the RI/FS report or a separate deliverable. The report must evaluate each technology's effectiveness, implementability, cost, and actual results as compared with predicted results. The report must also evaluate full scale application of the technology, including a sensitivity analysis identifying the key parameters affecting full-scale operation.

TASK 5 - FEASIBILITY STUDY

The Feasibility Study is comprised of two primary activities: (1) the development and screening of alternatives, and (2) the detailed analysis of alternatives. The alternatives surviving the screening process will be subject to the detailed analysis process. The FS Report must document the results of these two components of FS. Interim deliverables associated with these activities will be identified in the RI/FS Work Plan. The RI and FS

are interactive and will be conducted concurrently, to the extent practicable, in a manner that allows information and data collected during the RI to influence the development of remedial alternatives during the FS, which in turn affect additional information and data needs and the scope of any necessary treatability studies and risk assessments.

a. Remedial Alternative Development

The Respondent shall develop and evaluate a range of appropriate waste management options that, at a minimum, will remediate or control any contaminated media (soil, surface water, ground water, sediments) remaining at the Site, as deemed necessary in the RI to ensure protection of human health and the environment and comply with ARARs, concurrent with the RI site characterization task.

A range of remedial alternatives must be developed to identify and provide a variety of waste management options which then can be evaluated. This range of alternatives must include, as appropriate, options in which treatment is used to reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of wastes, but which varies in the types of treatment, the amount treated, and the manner in which long-term residuals or untreated wastes are managed. Options involving containment with little or no treatment must be included, as well as options involving both treatment and containment, and a no-action alternative. The following activities shall be performed by the Respondent during the development of remedial alternatives.

Refine and document remedial action objectives

Based on the BLRA, the Respondent shall review, and if necessary, modify the Site-specific remedial action objectives (RAOs) and the list of applicable preliminary remediation goals (PRGs). The modified PRGs shall be documented in a technical memorandum that will be reviewed and approved by EPA. These modified PRGs must specify the contaminants and media of interest, exposure pathways and receptors, and an acceptable contaminant level or range of levels (at particular locations for each exposure route).

Develop general response actions

The Respondent shall develop a range of general response actions for each medium of interest addressing containment, treatment, excavation, pumping, or any other actions, singly or in combination, that may be utilized to satisfy the remedial action objectives for the Site.

Identify areas or volumes of media

The Respondent shall identify volumes and/or areas of media to which general response actions might be applied, taking into account the requirements for protectiveness as identified in the RAOs and the chemical and physical characterization of the Site.

Identify, screen, and document remedial technologies

The Respondent shall identify and evaluate potential remedial technologies applicable to each general response action. The Respondent shall identify various alternatives for implementing each remedial technology. These alternatives must be evaluated and screened based upon their effectiveness, implementability, and cost factors. Generally, this screening is only necessary when there are many feasible alternatives available for detailed analysis. If necessary, the screening of alternatives shall be conducted to assure that only the alternatives with the most favorable composite evaluation of all factors are retained for further analysis. As appropriate, the screening must preserve the range of treatment and containment alternatives that was initially developed insuring that the alternatives will meet RAOs, ARARs and all other identified performance standards. The range of remaining alternatives must include options that use treatment technologies and permanent solutions to the maximum extent practicable. The Respondent shall prepare a technical memorandum summarizing the results and reasoning employed in screening and arraying alternatives that remain after screening. In addition, a description of the remedial technology alternatives which were eliminated from further consideration as well as the reasons for eliminating the alternatives must be included in the memorandum.

Assemble and document alternatives

The Respondent shall assemble selected representative technologies into a range of alternatives for each affected medium or operable unit. Together, all of the alternatives will represent treatment and containment combinations that will address either all of the Site or operable units. A summary of the assembled alternatives and their related action-specific ARARs must be prepared for EPA by the Respondent for inclusion in a technical memorandum.

TASK 6 - DETAILED ANALYSIS OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

The detailed analysis of alternatives shall be conducted by the Respondent to provide EPA with the information needed to allow for the selection of a Site remedy. This analysis is the final task to be performed by the Respondent during the FS.

a. Detailed Analysis of Alternatives

The Respondent shall conduct a detailed analysis of alternatives which must consist of an analysis of each option against a set of nine evaluation criteria and a comparative analysis of all options using the same evaluation criteria as a basis for comparison. EPA has developed the nine evaluation criteria to address the statutory requirements and preferences of CERCLA

Apply nine criteria and document analysis

The Respondent shall apply nine evaluation criteria to the assembled remedial alternatives to ensure that the selected remedial alternative will be protective of human health and the environment; will be in compliance with, or include a waiver of, ARARs; will be cost-effective; will utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies, or resource recovery technologies, to the maximum extent practicable; and will address the statutory preference for treatment as a principal element. The evaluation criteria include: (1) overall protection of human health and the environment; (2) compliance with ARARs; (3) long-term effectiveness and permanence; (4) reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume; (5) short-term effectiveness; (6) implementability; (7) costs; (8) state (or support agency) acceptance; and (9) community acceptance. (Note: Criteria 8 and 9 are considered after the RI/FS report has been released to the general public). For each alternative, the Respondent must provide: (1) a description of the alternative that outlines the waste management strategy involved and identifies the key ARARs associated with each alternative; and (2) a discussion of the individual criterion assessment.

Compare alternatives against each other and document the comparison of alternatives

The Respondent shall perform a comparative analysis between the remedial alternatives. That is, each alternative must be compared against the others using the evaluation criteria as a basis of comparison. Identification and selection of the preferred alternative are reserved by EPA. The Respondent shall prepare a technical memorandum summarizing the results of the comparative analysis.

Commented [LO14]: Will there be consultation with the Support Agencies?

b. Detailed Analysis Deliverables

In addition to the technical memorandum summarizing the results of the comparative analysis, the Respondent shall submit a draft FS report to the RPM for review and approval. Once EPA's comments have been addressed by the Respondent to the satisfaction of EPA, the final FS report may be bound with the final RI report.

Feasibility Study report

The Respondent shall submit a draft FS report for EPA and the Support Agencies' review and comment. This report, as ultimately adopted or amended by EPA, provides a basis for remedy selection by EPA, and documents the development and analysis of remedial alternatives. The Respondent shall refer to the RI/FS Guidance for an outline of the report format and the required report content, and a suggested format for the report can be found in Attachment D. The Respondent shall prepare a final FS report which satisfactorily addresses the comments.

Commented [LO15]: This is the first reference to Support Agencies in the draft SOW. Should Support Agencies be defined? Does the FS report need approval in addition to review and comment?

REFERENCES FOR CITATION

The following list, although not comprehensive, comprises many of the regulations and guidance documents that apply to the RI/FS process.

The (revised) National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP).

"Guidance for Conducting Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies Under CERCLA", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, October 1988, OSWER Directive No. 9355.3-01.

"Guidance on Oversight of Potentially Responsible Party Remedial Investigations and Feasibility Studies", U.S. EPA, Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, OSWER Directive No. 9835.3.

"Interim Guidance on Potentially Responsible Party Participation in Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Studies", U.S. EPA, Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, Appendix A to OSWER Directive No. 9355.3-01.

"A Compendium of Superfund Field Operations Methods", Two Volumes, U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, EPA/540/P-87/001a, August 1987, OSWER Directive No. 9355.0-14.

U.S. EPA, NEIC Policies and Procedures Manual", May 1978, revised November 1984, EPA -330/9-78-991-R.

"Data Quality Objectives for Remedial Response Activities", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response and Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, EPA/540/G-87/003, March 1987, OSWER Directive No. 9335.0-7B.

"Guidelines and Specifications for the Lead Agency(ies) Quality Assurance Project Plans", U.S. EPA, Office of Research and Development, Cincinnati, Ohio, QAMS-004/80, December 29, 1980.

"QA/R-5 *EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans* (latest draft or revision) and EPA QA/G-5 *EPA Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans* (latest draft or revision), EPA QA/G-4HW Data Quality Objectives Process for Hazardous Waste Site Studies, and EPA QA/G-4 Guidance for the Data Quality Objective Process"

"Interim Guidelines and Specifications for the Lead Agency(ies) Quality Assurance Project Plans", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, QAMS-005/80, December 1980.

"Users Guide to the Lead Agency(ies) Contract Laboratory Program, U.S. EPA, Sample Management Office, August 1982.

"Interim Guidance on Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, July 9, 1987, OSWER Directive No. 9234.0-05.

"CERCLA Compliance with Other Laws Manual", Two Volumes, U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, August 1988 (draft), OSWER Directive No. 9234.1-01 and -02.

"Guidance on Remedial Actions for Contaminated Groundwater at Superfund Sites", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, (draft), OSWER Directive No. 9283.1-2.

"Draft Guidance on the Lead Agency(ies) Superfund Decision Documents", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, March 1988, OSWER Directive No. 9355.3-02.

"Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund--Volume I, Human Health Evaluation Manual (Part A)", December 1989, EPA/540/1-89/002.

"Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund--Volume II Environmental Evaluation Manual", March 1989, EPA /540/1-89/001.

"Guidance for Data Usability in Risk Assessment", October 1990, EPA /540/G-90/008. "Performance of Risk Assessments in Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Studies (RI/FSs) Conducted by Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs)", August 28, 1990, OSWER Directive No. 9835.15.

"Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions", April 22, 1991, OSWER Directive No. 9355.0-30.

"Health and Safety Requirements of Employees Employed in Field Activities", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, July 12, 1981, EPA Order No. 1440.2.

OSHA Regulations in 29 CFR 1910.120 (Federal Register 45654, December 19, 1986).

"Interim guidance on Administrative Records for Selection of CERCLA Response Actions", U.S. EPA, Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, March 1, 1989, OSWER Directive No. 9833.3A.

"Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook", U.S. EPA, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, June 1988, OSWER Directive No. 9320.0-03B.

"Community Relations During Enforcement Activities and Development of the Administrative Record", U.S. EPA, Office of Waste Programs Enforcement, November 1988, OSWER Directive No. 9836.0-1A.

Attachments

Attachment A – Suggested RI/FS Work Plan Format

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
2. Site Background and Setting
3. Initial Evaluation
   - Types and volumes of waste present
   - Potential pathways of contaminant migration/preliminary public health and environmental impacts
   - Preliminary identification of operable units
   - Preliminary identification of response objectives and remedial action alternatives
4. Work Plan Rationale
   - DQO needs
   - Work Plan approach
5. RI/FS Tasks
6. Cost and Key Assumptions
7. Schedule
8. Project Management
   - Staffing
   - Coordination
9. References

Appendices

Attachment B – Suggested Format for SAP (FSP and QAPP)

FSP

1. Site Background
2. Sampling Objectives
3. Sample Location and Frequency
4. Sample Designation
5. Sampling Equipment and Procedures
6. Sample Handling and Analysis

QAPP

Project Management

A1 Title and Approval Sheet
A2 Table of Contents
A2 Distribution List
A4 Project/Task Organization
A5 Problem Definition/Background
A6 Project/Task Description
A7 Quality Objectives and Criteria
A8 Special Training/Certifications
A9 Documentation and Records

Data Generation and Acquisition

B1 Sampling Process Design (Experimental Design)
B2 Sampling Methods
B3 Sample Handling and Custody
B4 Analytical Methods
B5 Quality Control
B6 Instrument/Equipment Testing, Inspection, and Maintenance
B7 Instrument/Equipment Calibration and Frequency
B8 Inspection/Acceptance of Supplies and Consumables
B9 Non-direct Measurements
B10 Data Management

Assessment and Oversight

C1 Assessments and Response Actions
C2 Reports to Management

Data Validation and Usability

D1 Data Review, Verification, and Validation
D2 Verification and Validation Methods
D3 Reconciliation with User Requirements

~~Title Page~~

~~Table of Contents~~

~~1. Project Description~~

~~2. Project Organization and Responsibilities~~

~~3. QA Objectives for Measurement~~

~~4. Sampling Procedures~~

~~5. Sample Custody~~

~~6. Calibration Procedures~~

~~7. Analytical Procedures~~

~~8. Data Reduction, Validation, and Reporting~~

~~9. Internal Quality Control~~

~~10. Performance and Systems Audits~~

~~11. Preventative Maintenance~~

~~12. Data Assessment Procedures~~

~~13. Corrective Actions~~

~~14. Quality Assurance Reports~~

Attachment C – Suggested RI Report Format

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
   - 1.1 Purpose of Report
   - 1.2 Site Background
     - 1.2.1 Site Description
     - 1.2.2 Site History
     - 1.2.3 Previous Investigations
   - 1.3 Report Organization
2. Study Area Investigation
   - 2.1 Includes field activities associated with site characterization. These may include physical and chemical monitoring of some, but not necessarily all, of the following:
     - 2.1.1 Surface Features (topographic mapping, etc.) (natural and manmade features)
     - 2.1.2 Contaminant Source Investigations
     - 2.1.3 Meteorological Investigations
     - 2.1.4 Surface-Water and Sediment Investigations
     - 2.1.5 Geological Investigations
     - 2.1.6 Soil and Vadose Zone Investigations
     - 2.1.7 Ground-Water Investigations
     - 2.1.8 Human Population Surveys
     - 2.1.9 Ecological Investigations
   - 2.2 If technical memoranda documenting field activities were prepared, they may be included in an appendix and summarized in this report chapter
3. Physical Characteristics of the Study Area
   - 3.1 Includes results of field activities to determine physical characteristics. These may include some, but not necessarily all, of the following:
     - 3.1.1 Surface Features
     - 3.1.2 Meteorology
     - 3.1.3 Surface-Water Hydrology
     - 3.1.4 Geology
     - 3.1.5 Soils
     - 3.1.6 Hydrogeology
     - 3.1.7 Demography and Land Use
     - 3.1.8 Ecology
4. Nature and Extent of Contamination

4.1 Presents the results of Site characterization, both natural and chemical components and contaminants in some, but not necessarily all, of the following media:

4.1.1 Sources (lagoons, sludges, tanks, etc.)

4.1.2 Soils and Vadose Zone

4.1.3 Ground Water

4.1.4 Surface Water and Sediments

4.1.5 Air

5. Contaminant Fate and Transport

5.1 Potential Routes of Migration (i.e., air, groundwater, etc.)

5.2 Contaminant Persistence

5.2.1 If they are applicable (i.e., for organic contaminants), describe estimated persistence in the study area environment and physical, chemical, and/or biological factors of importance for the media of interest

5.3 Contaminant Migration

5.3.1 Discuss factors affecting contaminant migration for the media of important (e.g., sorption onto soils, solubility in water, movement of ground water, etc.)

5.3.2 Discuss modeling methods and results, if applicable

6. Baseline Risk Assessment

6.1 Human Health Evaluation

6.1.1 Exposure Assessment

6.1.2 Toxicity Assessment

6.1.3 Risk Characterization

6.2 Environmental Evaluation

7. Summary and Conclusions

7.1 Summary

7.1.1 Nature and Extent of Contamination

7.1.2 Fate and Transport

7.1.3 Risk Assessment

7.2 Conclusions

7.2.1 Data Limitations and Recommendations for Future Work

7.2.2 Recommended Remedial Action Objectives

Appendices

A. Technical Memorandum on Field Activities (if available)

B. Analytical Data and QA/QC Evaluation Results

C. Risk Assessment Methods

Attachment D – Suggested Format for Feasibility Study Report

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
   - 1.1 Purpose and Organization Report
   - 1.2 Background Information (Summarized from RI Report)
     - 1.2.1 Site Description
     - 1.2.2 Site History
     - 1.2.3 Nature and Extent of Contamination
     - 1.2.4 Contaminant Fate and Transport
     - 1.2.5 Baseline Risk Assessment
2. Identification and Screening of Technologies
   - 2.1 Introduction
   - 2.2 Remedial Action Objectives – Presents the development of remedial action objectives for each medium of interest (i.e., ground water, soil, surface water, air, etc.) For each medium, the following should be discussed:
     - Contaminants of interest
     - Allowable exposure based on risk assessment (including ARARs) Development of remediation goals
   - 2.3 General Response Actions – For each medium of interest, describes the estimation of areas or volumes to which treatment, containment, or exposure technologies may be applied.
   - 2.4 Identification and Screening of Technology Types and Process Options – For each medium of interest, describe:
     - 2.4.1 Identification and Screening of Technologies
     - 2.4.2 Evaluation of Technologies and Selection of Representative Technologies
3. Development and Screening of Alternatives
   - 3.1 Development of Alternatives – Describes rationale for combination of technologies/media into alternatives. Note: This discussion may be by medium or for the Site as a whole.
   - 3.2 Screening of Alternatives (if conducted)
     - 3.2.1 Introduction
     - 3.2.2 Alternative 1
       - 3.2.2.1 Description
       - 3.2.2.2 Evaluation
     - 3.2.2 Alternative 2
       - 3.2.2.1 Description
       - 3.2.2.2 Evaluation

Attachment E – Stibnite Mine Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) Statement of Work (SOW) Schedule

RI/FS Work Plan/Sampling and Analysis Plan (WP/SAP):

- Draft due within 120 days after the Effective Date of the Settlement Agreement/CO.
- Final Work Plan due within 90 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Data Summary Reports (DSRs):

- Draft DSRs due within 120 days completion of each season's field work or within 90 days of the receipt of final laboratory data, whichever is earlier. Within 5 days of the completion of each season's field work, Respondent shall provide written notification to EPA identifying the completion date. Within 5 days of the receipt of final laboratory data for the preceding field season, Respondent shall provide written notification to EPA identifying the receipt date of final laboratory data.
- Final DSRs due within 30 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Remedial Investigation Report (RI):

- Submit draft RI within 120 days after receipt of laboratory data from the final field season. Within 5 days of receipt of final laboratory data, Respondent shall provide written notification to EPA identifying receipt date of final laboratory data.
- Final RI due within 60 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Baseline Risk Assessment Report (BLRA):

- Submit draft BLRA within 60 days after submittal of Final RI.
- Final BLRA due within 60 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Feasibility Study (FS):

- Submit draft FS within 120 days after submittal of BLRA Report.
- Final FS due within 90 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Data Validation Summaries (DVSs):

- DVSs due within 120 days from the date of collection of the last sample from each sampling event. Within 5 days of the completion of each season's field work, Respondent shall provide written notification to EPA identifying the date of collection of the last sample from each sampling event.

Interim Deliverables

- Draft Interim Deliverables (i.e., Technical Memoranda for Treatability Studies Preliminary Remedial Goals, Remedial Action Objectives, etc.) as identified in the SOW, or as required by EPA, shall be due within 30 days receipt of notice by Respondent that said Deliverable is required.
- Final Interim Deliverables due within 60 days of receipt of consolidated Agency comments.

Quarterly Progress Reports

- Quarterly Progress Reports shall be due 15 days after the end of the previous calendar quarter.

[1]Documents may initially be released as "draft final" pending final resolution of issues.



Figure 1 – Site Location



Figure 2 – Stibnite Mine Site



Figure 3 –Yellow Pine Pit



Figure 4 – Historical Tailings and Spent Ore Disposal Area



Figure 5 – Hecla Heap Leach Facility



Figure 6 – Bailey Tunnel



Figure 7 – Defense Minerals Exploration Administration Adit and Waste Rock Dump



Figure 8 – Bonanza Adit



Figure 9 – Cinnabar Tunnel



Figure 10 – Meadow Creek Adit

EXHIBIT 15

to

Declaration of Michael Bogert

Draft Statement of Work for Stibnite Mine RI/FS
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' Comments
November 12, 2019, updated November 13, 2019

General Comments and Questions:

1. Many places throughout the Statement of Work (SOW) should refer to "analyses" rather than "analysis."
2. Does the Mining Plan of Restoration and Operations (PRO) cover all of Midas Gold's patented land, other than the DMEA Adit and Waste Rock Dump (#5 on page 2) and the Bonanza Adit (#6)? What are the plans for the parcels of land outside the PRO?
3. The SOW refers to the PRO, which is very lengthy; we would like some time to review the PRO in its entirety. Our initial comments regarding the PRO are as follows: (1) The PRO refers to a Technical Report and a Pre-Feasibility Report that have been conducted, and we're assuming much of the data in these reports will be used for the RI/FS. The data should be of Tier 4 Quality if it will be used for human health risk purposes. (2) The PRO references Canadian Mining Principles, N143-101. We think that U.S. guidance should be used.

Purpose/Description of the Site:

Page 2 - The Site is defined by 8 areas. Areas #5 and #6 (DMEA Adit and Waste Rock Dump and Bonanza Adit) are listed as not within the footprint of the Midas Gold PRO. The distance of these two areas from proposed mining activities should be listed, as well as any overflow expectations, connectivity of features to proposed mining, tailings, and expected or unexpected impacts on the hydrogeology of both surface water and groundwater.

Oversight:

Page 3 – The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes ("SBT" or "Tribes") should be listed as an oversight Agency, along with the EPA, USFS and IDEQ. [Note –The term "Agency" in the rest of these comments is intended to include the SBT.]

SBT should receive copies of all reports, etc., because the Tribes plan to comment on these documents as part of their oversight responsibilities. This seems to be what Midas Gold intended, since Attachment E (schedule) refers throughout to "consolidated Agency comments." We added specific references to SBT/Tribes (which could be changed to "Agencies" assuming SBT is added as an "Agency" and assuming that the other Agencies want to be included) where we thought appropriate, just to be sure. For example, on page 3 the last full paragraph should say "Respondent shall submit all documents or deliverables required as part of this SOW to EPA and the Tribes, for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval." The last paragraph should say "Throughout the process of developing the RI/FS, the Respondent shall prepare and submit Quarterly Progress Reports to EPA and the Tribes to aid in project planning."

Guidance:

Page 4 – All Guidance documents followed should be the most up to date drafts.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Page 4 – Please add the underlined language for clarity, since there's a required process for EPA to go through before issuing a ROD: "At the completion of the RI/FS . . . in a Record of Decision (ROD), consistent with the NCP."

Task 1 - Scoping:

Page 4 – "Respondent shall document the specific project scope in the RI/FS Work Plan, which shall be consistent with the AOC." Also, "During the scoping process, the Site- specific objectives of the RI/FS . . . will be proposed by the Respondent but will be determined ~~and approved~~ by EPA."

Page 5 – "When scoping the specific aspects of this project, Respondent shall meet with EPA and the Tribes either in person or telephonically to discuss all project planning decisions and special concerns associated with the Site."

Page 5 – "The Respondent, ~~and~~ EPA and the Tribes shall conduct a Site visit during the project scoping phase."

Page 6 – "The Respondent shall meet with EPA's Remedial Project Manager (RPM) and with the appropriate contact from the Tribes (either in person or telephonically) regarding the following activities and before drafting the scoping deliverables listed below."

Page 7 – Document the Need for Treatability Studies – "Should treatability studies be determined to be necessary, a testing plan . . . should be submitted to EPA and the Tribes for review and for EPA's approval."

Page 7 – Scoping Deliverables – "These plans must be reviewed by EPA and the Tribes and approved by EPA prior to the initiation of field activities."

Page 7 - RI/FS Work Plan – "A Work Plan documenting the decisions and evaluations completed during the scoping process shall be submitted to the RPM and the Tribes for review and for EPA's approval."

Pages 11 through 14 – Potential Target Analytes – The only radiological constituent listed is uranium, and it isn't listed for all media. Since uranium may be a concern, as indicated by it being listed as a COPC for surface water, then uranium and all associated uranium daughters should be listed as COPCs in all media.

Task 2 - Community Relations:

Page 14 – "Respondent may assist by providing information regarding the Site's history, participating in public and community (including tribal community) meetings, and preparing fact sheets for distribution to the general public and relevant tribes, including the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes." All impacted tribes should be included, even though the Shoshoni historically were the main tribes in this area.

Also, SBT would like to have a copy of the administrative record kept at Fort Hall so that it is readily available to tribal members, especially those who exercise their treaty rights in this area. And finally, "Any PRP-conducted community relations activities will be subject to oversight by EPA and the other Agencies."

Task 3 - Site Characterization

Page 15, 2d ¶ – "The Respondent shall notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies at least two weeks in advance of the field work regarding the planned dates for field activities . . . ."

Same edit in last sentence on pages 15-16: "The Respondent shall notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies at least two weeks prior to initiating field support activities so that EPA may adequately schedule oversight tasks. The Respondent shall also notify the RPM and the relevant contacts for the other Agencies upon completion of field support activities."

Page 17 – "All data and programming, including any proprietary programs, shall be made available to EPA and the Tribes together with a sensitivity analysis.

Page 18 – same edit: "All validated data shall be made available to EPA and the Tribes in electronic format. . . . Field and validated analytical data results for all media sampled shall be submitted to EPA and the Tribes by uploading the data . . . ."

Page 18 – Similarly, "The Respondent shall prepare and submit a draft RI report to the RPM for review and approval, and shall provide a copy of the report to the Tribes."

Page 19 – The Tribes would provide comments on the report, but they could do so directly to Midas Gold or through EPA (see first complete sentence at the top of p. 19).

Page 19 – BLRA – The EPA human health risk assessment must include a tribal scenario.

Task 4 – Treatability Studies

Page 20 – first sentence: "Respondent shall identify in a technical memorandum, subject to EPA and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval, candidate technologies for a treatability studies program during project planning (Task 1)."

Page 20 – Evaluation of Treatability Studies – "Once a decision has been made to perform treatability studies, the Respondent and EPA, in consultation with the Tribes, will decide the types of treatability testing to utilize. . . . the Respondent shall either submit to the RPM and the Tribes a treatability testing work plan or an amendment to the original Site work plan for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval."

Pages 20-21 – Treatability Testing Work Plan – "The Respondent shall prepare a treatability testing work plan or amendment to the original Site Work Plan for EPA's and the Tribes' review and EPA's approval." Same edit to Treatability Study SAP.

Task 5 – Feasibility Study

Page 22 – "The modified PRGs shall be documented in a technical memorandum that will be reviewed by EPA and the Tribes and approved by EPA."

Attachment C – Suggested RI Report Format

Vegetation results need to be included here so the Tribes can see what has been evaluated. If they aren't included, this will be a major data gap.